

THE PAPERS *of the*
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

VOLUME FORTY-NINE

THIRD QUARTER, 1955

Bibliographical Files for Research
in the Yale University Libraries*

By MARJORIE GRAY WYNNE

IT is a great temptation, when addressing an audience at once imaginative and influential, to abandon reality for a moment and wistfully to describe certain details of an ideal bibliographical life. Mr. Richard Altick, in presenting his version of the scholar's paradise to a gathering of librarians a few months ago,¹ may secretly have hoped that one of them would some day be able to supply him with the air-conditioning system permeated with benzedrine, the inconspicuous intercommunication box into which he would murmur the title of any book he wanted to see, and the velvet-lined conveyor belt on which the same book would slide silently to his side in less than thirty seconds. The intercommunication system would also be used to answer any question that entered his mind during the course of a working day, and for this purpose it would be connected with the reference department where a dulcet-voiced and omniscient librarian would be ready to answer every question the moment it had been phrased.

* Read at the meeting of the Society in New York, January 28, 1955.

¹ Richard D. Altick, "The Scholar's Paradise," *College and Research Libraries*, XV (October 1954), 375-382.

Air-conditioning units, intercommunication systems, and conveyor belts are surely not beyond the dreams of the most demanding scholar; the real problem is where to find the omniscient librarian. He doesn't exist, he can't be made, and his only conceivable substitute is a monumental machine of the IBM variety. Into this machine (standard equipment in my version of the librarian's paradise) would go a card for every book and manuscript in the library, and out of it would come the answer to every question.

While waiting for such a machine to be invented, the Yale Library has, from time to time, made certain special files or indexes which in an infinitesimal way help to answer some of the extraordinary questions that are put to its staff members during an ordinary day. These files, for the most part additional and supplementary to the catalogue cards that are made for every book and manuscript in the library, are scattered throughout the main building and are occasionally found in outlying school and departmental libraries. Some are used frequently, some almost never, but each one was begun with the conviction that only through such a particular file could a certain kind of information be made available to whoever might happen to need it.

My predecessor in the Rare Book Room began and, with the most remarkable enthusiasm extending over a period of sixteen years, kept up two of the largest files in the library—a provenance file and a binding file, now occupying a total of twenty-three trays. So far as was humanly possible, she made a slip for every name, set of initials, and bookplate in every book that passed through her hands. And the books that did pass through her hands were not just those that were being assembled in the Rare Book Room. She roamed the stacks, rummaged through new shipments, invaded other special collections, and was generally indefatigable in her search for signs of provenance. It is not to be assumed for a moment, however, that every former owner who left his mark on a book in the Yale Library is listed in the prove-

nance file, for the library was much too large, before this file was begun, to allow the systematic, book-by-book examination which alone would have made it complete. Today, the provenance of very few books that go to the stacks is recorded in this file, but it is moderately safe to say that marks of ownership in most of the one hundred and twelve thousand books in the Rare Book Room have been discovered and noted and that the books in several of the other special collections have been examined with equal diligence.

In making these slips (for Rare Book Room material at least) no attempt is made to select the important names from among those that are legibly written in a book (guesses are discouraged), and therefore the modest and forgotten Mary Smiths and John Browns (practicing their penmanship on blank endpapers) are as frequently represented as the Michael Wodhulls and the Beverly Chews. The uses of such a file, lacunose as it may be, are obvious, if somewhat restricted. When Mr. W. A. Jackson was establishing the present location of John L. Clawson's early English books for the volume of essays honoring the late Dr. Rosenbach on his seventieth birthday, the Yale Library was able to account for forty-three volumes by consulting the provenance file. (A recent glance at this file shows that nine Clawson books have subsequently been acquired and three replaced by better copies.) When a doctoral candidate working on William Cowper was trying to discover what books the poet and members of his circle might have read, the provenance file showed that the Yale Library had several books that had been in their possession, at least one of which contained important marginal annotations. When the library wanted to verify a supposed signature of Increase Mather, it was able, through the provenance file, to produce several books already in its collection, bearing the genuine Mather signature.

The binding file, which occupies only three of the twenty-three trays, must, of course, be used in conjunction with the provenance file, for the arms, crest, or initials stamped on the cover of a vol-

ume are as acceptable a sign of ownership as the bookplate or autograph. Binders themselves are listed here, naturally; certain persons and personifications used in design—Dido, Judith with the head of Holofernes, Faith, Justice, Mathematica, etc.; and miscellaneous oddities such as the girdle book, chained binding, envelope binding, and dos-à-dos binding. The preparation of binding exhibitions is obviously much simplified by this file, and *only* through such a file can we answer requests like the recent one for photographs of all our examples of the work done by The Club Bindery.

Another and different approach to provenance can be made through an index to the library's holdings of catalogues issued by auction houses. Here each catalogue is not only listed under the name of the firm from which it comes but is also analyzed for the names of individuals whose books and manuscripts are being sold. These auction and owner indexes are part of a series of fifty-four trays devoted to book catalogues of all kinds, issued by firms in this country and abroad.

Newspapers and periodicals, especially early ones, are invaluable mines of information for the social, political, and literary historian, but sometimes the mining operation, in sheer tedium and involution, is disproportionate to the unearthed nugget. The scholar's approach to newspapers, more often than not, is by date and place rather than by title. Something that interests him happened on May 21, 1752, and he wants to read all the contemporary accounts of that event in all the local newspapers that he can find. What newspapers does Yale have for May 21, 1752? For years we struggled awkwardly with endless questions like this and listened patiently to endless monologues on the subject of a chronological file, delivered by a local scholar of equal persuasiveness and perseverance. At last, a few months ago, we compiled a chronological file of our eighteenth-century English newspapers, and plan to do the same for American newspapers as soon as possible. In one catalogue tray, we now have a tool of in-

estimable value to all students of the eighteenth century—hundreds of slips arranged by year and by month, giving the title of the newspaper, its date of issue, and its call number.

A larger and older index to newspapers is arranged by place of publication. This file includes American and foreign newspapers from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, listed alphabetically by state or country, and then by city. There is only one card for each title and specific holdings are not given here, but, for a general idea of the period of publication, inclusive dates of the issues in the Yale Library are pencilled on the upper right-hand corner.

A chronological guide to both printed and manuscript material is one of the most obvious responsibilities of any research library, and Yale has been able to provide such a guide for at least one category of voluminous and ephemeral printed matter, its so-called British tracts. A British tract, according to our definition, is anything less than one hundred pages printed in Great Britain, or printed elsewhere but *about* Great Britain or her colonies generally. Sermonic and literary material is excluded, as well as works purely scientific or philosophical, but the remaining political, economic and religious tracts, from the invention of printing to 1800, have been indexed by date, in a file that now occupies twenty catalogue trays.

Such a file has obvious possibilities, but yet another step is required to make this kind of material even more useful. Many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century pamphlets have extraordinary titles which give little or no indication of their contents. Who could know, for example, that something called *A Letter from No Body in the City to No Body in the Country* is concerned, among other things, with an attempted assassination of Charles II? Our persuasive and persevering friend already referred to (having been only temporarily placated by the chronological index to eighteenth-century newspapers) is now directing his powers towards a larger and more complicated project. He insists (and after read-

ing a few titles who can contradict him?) that the historian can tell nothing by a title, that he must be able to examine easily and quickly on open shelves, all the pamphlet material, both English and American, that appeared within the period of his particular interest. If and when we ever attempt to bring all the pre-1800 pamphlets together in one chronological arrangement, the British Tract file will be the convenient starting point.

The library has three files in which printed material is indexed by place of publication. Each incunabulum, of which there are over two thousand at Yale, is represented by a card with a triplex heading—city, printer, and date—and these are filed behind guide cards to the appropriate countries, alphabetically arranged. (Such a file is indispensable in preparing the forthcoming checklist of our incunabula.) In view of the fact that the early printers moved about so casually and so nimbly, it has been suggested that another file—by printer—would be as useful as the one by place, but so far this suggestion has not been adopted.

The second file arranged by place, called Printing Specimens, is mentioned here simply as an example of misguided enthusiasm. No additions have been made to it in the past decade, and no one has yet had the courage to discard the two trays of cards. From what we can learn of its beginnings, this file seems to have been started at the request of the printer to the university. Examples of fine printing were selected—sometimes by the printer, sometimes by the cataloguer—and represented by one card with a five-part heading: country, century, city, printer, and date. Such a file was obviously doomed from the beginning, for its existence depended upon selectivity, and selectivity is a dangerous element in the maintenance of bibliographical files. If certain printers and presses had been chosen at the beginning—from Gutenberg to Grabhorn—and if *every* volume that each of them printed had been represented in this file, then it might have survived, but to depend upon the personal taste of a number of individuals is to court almost certain defeat.

Our third and largest place file is confined to books printed in Connecticut up to 1850. Nine trays contain cards arranged by place and then by date, with Hartford, New Haven, and New London leading the field in publishing activity.

The files that have been mentioned so far are maintained by the Catalogue Department, the Rare Book Room, or the Reading Room, and are located on the ground floor of the main library. Several special collections, on the upper floors of the same building, also have various kinds of bibliographical files, generally prepared by their individual curators. In the Goethe Collection there are twenty-five catalogue trays filled with indexes to the following material: articles about Goethe (by title of periodical and author of article); poems by Goethe (by title and first line); Goethe in America (any book by or about Goethe printed in the western hemisphere); medals struck in his honor; views of scenes associated with Goethe; portraits of Goethe and his contemporaries (by subject and artist); illustrations to his works; popular quotations; and theatre programs to performances of his plays.

The Babylonian Collection, headquarters of cuneiform studies in western Asia from 3000 B.C. to the Christian Era, has about fifty trays of assorted files: a subject index to the more interesting and important tablets, and an index to those texts that have been published; an index to published seal impressions (this file, arranged by date, gives a small picture of the seal, tells where the text has been published, and includes the holdings not only of Yale but of cuneiform collections all over the world); an index to small and hitherto undescribed collections, both public and private, wherever located (this index is being prepared for publication); an index to the museum numbers of all published texts, and finally an index to periodical literature, where every article is represented by at least two cards—one under author and one or more under classified subjects.

The Map Collection, in addition to the general catalogue of its holdings, arranged by area and by date, has a special file of map

makers, publishers and engravers to 1850, and a chronological file of atlases.

A few miscellaneous aids to research which might be mentioned here (and these are not all in the shape of card files) include an index to obituaries in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (this takes up where the printed index leaves off); the slips from which Mr. Wing prepared his continuation of the *Short-Title Catalogue* from 1641 to 1700 and on which may be found the location of copies of books in excess of the ten listed in the printed catalogues; Miss Bartlett's up-to-the-minute notes on the change of ownership of Shakespeare quartos and the location of hitherto unrecorded copies;² and an annotated copy of the catalogue of the National Portrait Gallery, accompanied by photographs of the portraits themselves.

The departmental libraries, in separate buildings about the campus, have surprisingly few special files. The Library of the School of Medicine has a provenance file; the Library of the Divinity School has an imprint file in which American imprints before 1820 and all others before 1800 are arranged chronologically; the Library of the School of Law has a provenance file, and an imprint file of its early material (for example, European imprints before 1601, Latin American before 1801, British before 1641, and so on), and the Library of the School of Music has a file of publishers' plate numbers. These plate numbers, found on most pieces of sheet music, are rather like serial numbers and may be used to assign approximate dates to undated music. Within the past few years, more and more printed indexes to sheet music are appearing, and for this reason very few additions are currently being made to the file in the School of Music.

I should like to conclude with a brief description of some of the myriad files that are maintained in those strongholds of eighteenth-century scholarship—inelegantly referred to as factories

² Henrietta C. Bartlett & Alfred W. Pollard, *A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1939). An interleaved copy is in the Rare Book Room.

—the Walpole, Boswell, and Franklin collections. The Walpole factory consists of two rooms, several men, dozens of reference books, 375 rolls of microfilm, and 100 trays of miscellaneous files. The largest and most important file concerns the manuscript letters written by and to Horace Walpole. Specially designed cards give varied information about each letter, and statistics on the entire collection are compiled periodically. As of last July, 7274 letters by Walpole or addressed to him were known to exist, and of this number 2638 were owned by Mr. Lewis. Other figures are easily available; for example the number of known correspondents (603), the number of probable correspondents (163), and the number of letters that Walpole must have written but that cannot now be found (1388). In two complementary files, the complete collection of letters is indexed by date and by owner. There is also an index to Walpole's manuscript annotations in the books from his library, an index to visitors to Strawberry Hill (prepared in part from the film of a notebook in the Harvard Library), and an index to articles and reviews about Walpole, arranged by author, subject, and date.

Manuscripts and printed books, not always relating directly to Walpole but rich in the kind of background material so necessary to his editors, have also been carefully indexed. These include the ninety-five manuscript letter books of Sir Charles Hanbury Williams, poet, wit, diplomatist and friend of Walpole; the collection of eighteenth-century tradesmen's cards assembled by and still in the possession of Sir Ambrose Heal, a twentieth-century designer and maker of furniture; Jesse's edition of *George Selwyn and his Contemporaries* (London, 1882), supplemented by unpublished Selwyn manuscripts at Farmington, and Chamberlayne's *Magnae Britanniae Notitia* (London, 1741), from which an alphabetical file of all offices held under the Crown, the City of London and Westminster, the two universities, etc., has been compiled.

At Mr. Lewis's home in Farmington, where the Walpole

books and manuscripts themselves are kept, there are files too numerous to describe in any way commensurate with their ingenuity or usefulness. There are provenance files, and files of purchases by Walpole, gifts to Walpole arranged by donor, and individual buyers at the Strawberry Hill sale. There are several files relating exclusively to Strawberry Hill—visitors, by name and by date; books and pamphlets printed at Strawberry Hill; a catalogue of the library, by author and press number, with visible tabs indicating the present owners; a file of the pictures at Strawberry Hill, and a file of the contents of that building apart from books and pictures.

Walpole's plan to write the history of his time—with as much emphasis on contemporary thought and life as on foreign affairs and Parliamentary news—prompted him to collect large numbers of plays, poems and tracts as rapidly as they appeared. He annotated them, he mentioned them in his letters, and indexes to the three collections—the poems by author and title, the plays by title, and the tracts by title and date—are obviously of the greatest interest and importance to his present editors. Most of the original tracts and many of the plays have been re-assembled at Farmington, while the entire collection of poems is at Harvard.

At Farmington the letters are again indexed by author and by date, with visible tabs showing present owners; and a chronological file of photostats showing examples of Walpole's handwriting for every year of his epistolary life helps immensely in assigning dates to undated letters.

Additional files have been made for eighteenth-century prints (by artist and subject); for prints of country seats (by seat and owner); for reviews of early and late editions of Walpole's works, and for sale and auction catalogues containing works by Walpole. And finally, there are twelve folio volumes with specially designed pages for every day in the year, where the following information about Walpole can be recorded: where he was, letters written and received, guests, health, and important events.

As a supplement to the entries about his general health, there is one file devoted entirely to Walpole and the gout. Wherever, in his letters from 1755 to 1796, he mentioned that malady either as a reality or an expectation, the full passage has been copied and filed chronologically—an edifying record for the specialist in psychosomatic medicine as well as for the diagnostician.

The headquarters of the private papers of James Boswell are adjacent and in many ways similar to those of Horace Walpole, a fact which would no doubt be very pleasing to the adulatory Scot if he were able to return to the local scene. His personal letters are indexed by recipient, and letters addressed to him, by author. Other manuscripts by Boswell, his family and friends, are indexed by author, and all are again represented in a chronological file.

From 1763 to 1790 (with the exception of two years in the mid-sixties) Boswell kept a register of letters received and sent, and on many occasions copied into the register long extracts from the letters themselves. An alphabetical index to this chronological record is of the greatest importance in determining the size and relative completeness of a given correspondence. Biographical and geographical files, identifying respectively every person and every place mentioned in the Boswell papers, are equally important in the work of editing the manuscripts.

Further biographical facts may be found in indexes which have been prepared to the obituaries in *The Scots Magazine* (at present covering the period from 1776 to 1807, but eventually to go through 1817); to "Scholars of James Mundell in Edinburgh, 1735-1762" (from a notebook compiled by Cameron Smith and lent by the Ewart Public Library, Dumfries, Scotland); and to *Records of My Life*, by John Taylor, the drama critic, editor, and miscellaneous writer who knew and wrote about so many of Boswell's contemporaries. An index to Volume Five of Brown's supplement to Morison's *Dictionary of Decisions* is of particular help in following the legal career of James Boswell.

Plans for publishing the papers of Benjamin Franklin were announced only last year, and consequently the editorial work on this project has just begun. Since Yale and the American Philosophical Society together own about half of the original manuscripts, the first task has been to assemble photostats. Six thousand have been received and indexed so far, and the total number is expected to reach 30,000. Two of the indexes already adopted by the Franklin editors are of course like those in the Walpole and Boswell headquarters: by author and by date. In addition, they have indexes by number (an accession number which is assigned to each photostat as it arrives), by source, and by subject—this last a new feature where already one can find references to the cultivation of mulberry trees in Pennsylvania, tobacco ashes as a cure for dropsy, electrical experiments on torpedo fish, the lightning rod, and the best remedy for smoky chimneys.

Form sheets for a day-by-day chronology of Franklin's activities have been modelled on those at Farmington, and it is quite likely that other indexes will be compiled as the need for them becomes apparent.

There are two facts that should be emphasized in any discussion of these three eighteenth-century editorial projects, and the first is that none of their many special files is the result of sheer exuberance. Each is a tool designed to supply information that is essential to the scholar and that cannot be found elsewhere. And the second is that none of them is supported by library funds.

Special files of any description, whether for printed books or manuscript materials, are expensive to make and to maintain, and there are few libraries today which think that they can afford them. Indeed most libraries are relinquishing their responsibilities at a time when they should instead be assuming new ones, and the uncontrolled acquisition of millions of books plus drastic economies in cataloguing may eventually lead to chaos. Simplified cataloguing by author and subject *only* is no longer sufficient for the large research library; other approaches are becoming

more and more important. In the Yale Library we were unable to help the man who wanted, within a few minutes, books with pictures of eighteenth-century angels, or the one who wanted all the books printed in Amsterdam in 1663, or again the one who wanted a chronological file of every book in the library. We may be inclined to think that such questions are ludicrous, but they and others like them are put to us every day, and eventually we must begin to do something about inventing that machine for answering them.

Anglo-American Parliamentary Reporting: A Case Study in Historical Bibliography

By ROBERT R. REA

THE historian's obligation to bibliographical study is often relegated to footnotes and appendices wherein a multitude of sins, both of omission and commission, may be easily covered. Yet in such work must historical study often place its dependence for accuracy of description and much plain fact. This is peculiarly true of the study of eighteenth-century parliamentary history. The weakness of standard accounts of debates is common knowledge, but few efforts have been made to draw together the mass of material necessary to describe with assurance any given session, debate, or even single speech in the British Parliament. The desirability of such study is indicated by an investigation of one of the major efforts of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, at the outset of the American Revolution.

On the afternoon of January 20, 1775, Chatham rose in the House of Lords to offer a motion to withdraw the British troops under General Gage from the town of Boston "in order to open the Way towards an happy Settlement of the dangerous Troubles in *America*."¹ The proposal was supported by one of Chatham's finest speeches. The effect upon the House was negligible—the motion was rejected by a great majority—but Chatham had declared himself the friend of America, and all her other friends might rejoice in his stand. As fast as pen and press could dispatch his words that message sped westward on the winter winds.

But what, precisely, did he say? Therein lay the difficulty, for

¹ *Journal of the House of Lords*, XXXIV, 290.

each man who heard him caught a phrase, a rolling period, but not the whole of Chatham's flowing rhetoric. Parliamentary reporting was far from perfect, and Chatham disdained the written draft culled and pruned for public consumption. He spoke from head and heart and left posterity to follow as it could.

Many accounts of Chatham's speech survive, and have been adjudged meritorious or faulty on a variety of grounds. In 1913 Basil Williams, in his great *Life of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham*, sought to collect and collate all extant reports of this and other speeches in order that a definitive study might be made. His findings have been accepted by nearly all later writers, but, careful scholar though he was, Williams fell short of his goal. The materials he failed to utilize have formal bibliographical interest; they offer a succinct example of the methods of news-dissemination at the time of the American Revolution; and they also include that which should be described as the most authentic version of the speech, one published in those American colonies for which Chatham spoke so eloquently.

The sources for Chatham's speech may be divided into three categories. In the first group lie those versions privately prepared and communicated by men who either heard the speech or heard detailed descriptions of the debate immediately after the House rose. The second division consists of those accounts which were rushed into print through newspaper, magazine, and pamphlet in Britain and America. A third category includes those versions presented to the public several years after the event in collections of speeches, histories, and biographies of the great orator. Within these various forms, Basil Williams noted thirteen versions of which eleven may be classified as Anglo-American.² A closer study shows the existence of over three times as many sources and also discloses that many of these have no independent value, although they have long been cited as authoritative.

² Two reports by foreign agents of France and the Netherlands will be eliminated from further consideration here, because of their secret character and complete isolation from the scene of public opinion.

I. *Private Communications*

The first reports of Chatham's speech were those drawn up by his auditors for the information of their friends and associates. As Chatham maintained strict secrecy concerning his plans, only Lords Stanhope and Shelburne, among the politicians, had prior advice of his motion. Rumor had circulated freely, however, and *aficionados* like Horace Walpole waited eagerly to catch the first words from Chatham's lips.

A report was dispatched from Chatham's household on the morning following the debate by the Earl's younger son, William Pitt. The sixteen-year-old boy had proudly accompanied his father to the House of Lords and hastened to assure his mother that the speech was "the most forcible that can be imagined. . . . The matter and manner both were striking; far beyond what I can express." How ironic that young Mr. Pitt, who within a few short years would be the recognized master of parliamentary debate, could only regret in 1775 that he had not the "time and memory to give an account of all I heard, and all I felt."³ No more than this was forthcoming from Chatham, save only a copy of the motion itself which was forwarded to Benjamin Franklin.⁴ This was a gracious personal gesture toward the distinguished American, but of little value. Any reader of the London newspapers could learn as much for himself.

For one to whom Chatham's motion meant so much Benjamin Franklin left a disappointingly small account of evidence concerning the speech. Late in December 1774 the American had met with Chatham, and in the course of their discussion Franklin suggested the withdrawal of troops from Boston and elsewhere in the colonies as a preliminary to pacification. Chatham was obviously taken with the idea, and invited Franklin to witness his

³ W. S. Taylor and J. H. Pringle, eds., *Correspondence of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (London, 1840), IV, 375-379.

⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, 385-386; A. H. Smyth, ed., *Writings of Benjamin Franklin* (New York, 1906), VI, 361-362.

effort as his guest in the House of Lords. Franklin was flattered by the attention of England's greatest statesman and "the more pleased" with the motion "as I conceived it had partly taken its rise from a hint I had given his Lordship in a former conversation."⁵

During the last week of January, the two men were in close contact. On the 27th Chatham informed Franklin of a projected second motion, and at the time urged upon him the need for the greatest secrecy for "otherwise parts might be misunderstood and flown upon beforehand."⁶ While showing Chatham's normal propensity for secrecy, this demand may also reflect his dissatisfaction with the treatment accorded the first motion in the press. Writing to Charles Thompson, secretary of Congress, on February 5, Franklin mentioned Chatham's motion but left detail to be supplied by papers which he enclosed. However, Franklin warned Thompson, "The speeches hitherto published as his [*i.e.* Chatham's] during the Session, are spurious."⁷ This warning is of interest. Franklin was in a good position to judge independently, and also to know Chatham's opinion of the earliest reports of the speech. As the Earl was mightily disturbed by these, Franklin's statement probably expresses the orator's opinion rather than his own; it is in fact almost a quotation from Chatham's public denunciation of the printed version then current. From his long experience in publishing just such political material, Franklin was wise in the ways of editorial caution.⁸ Not wishing to endanger his position with one of America's few friends, he accepted Chatham's denial of the printed accounts in February—and then reversed himself in March. Discussing these events in "An Account of Negotiations in London," Franklin again omitted any

⁵ Smyth, *Franklin*, VI, 351, 361.

⁶ *Ibid.*, VI, 364.

⁷ *Ibid.*, VI, 306.

⁸ See V. W. Crane, *Benjamin Franklin's Letters to the Press* (Chapel Hill, 1950), xxxvii, xliii; and "Franklin's Political Journalism in England," in *Meet Dr. Franklin* (Philadelphia, 1943), 63-81.

elaboration of the January 20 speech, on the specific grounds that its insertion was unnecessary "as you may find a better [account] in the Papers of the time."⁹ He had by then cut his ties with Britain, and might express himself with freedom from the dangers of postal censorship and alienation of British sympathy. His suggestion has, however, been ignored by all writers since 1775! It is worth reconsidering here, especially since Franklin demonstrated his immediate interest in Chatham's actions by sending to America not only copies of the second Chatham motion on February 1, but also six printed copies of the speech itself.¹⁰

One of the most anxious of Chatham's American auditors was Josiah Quincy, Jr. Recently come to London from Boston, young Quincy was feverishly engaged in playing out the last moments of his life as an intelligence agent for the colonial cause. On the day of Chatham's speech, Quincy gained entry to the House of Lords and by good fortune secured "one of the best places for hearing, and taking a few minutes."¹¹ From his notes Quincy elaborated a full rhetorical version of the speech in which he sought to do justice to "the illustrious sage" whose "language, voice, and gesture were more pathetic than I ever saw or heard before."¹² On January 22 a copy of this document was dispatched with "a very long letter" to Mrs. Abigail Quincy. Another copy he retained in London and ultimately inserted at the proper place in his daily journal.¹³ Quincy took great pains with this work, and "had great satisfaction in reading my reports of the debates in the House of Lords to one or two friends who heard them. They thought them exceedingly correct."¹⁴ Further evidence of

⁹ Smyth, *Franklin*, VI, 361.

¹⁰ Carl Van Doren, *Benjamin Franklin's Autobiographical Writings* (New York, 1945), 343-346.

¹¹ Josiah Quincy, ed., *Memoir of the Life of Josiah Quincy, Jun.* (Boston, 1825), 318.

¹² *Ibid.*, 318-319.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1874), 277.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 2nd ed., 283.

his exactitude was offered by Benjamin Franklin, to whom Quincy's father forwarded a copy of the speech in November 1775. The younger Quincy was then dead, and Franklin took the occasion to remark that "the notes of the speeches taken by your son . . . are exceedingly valuable, as being by much the best account preserved of that day's debate."¹⁵

The next significant private report of the speech was prepared by Jonathan Williams, Franklin's great-nephew, who "by great good luck, & a little contrivance" got into the House of Lords when Chatham spoke. Williams' account of the speech, incorporated in a letter to America dated January 21, is a full report of the proceedings and includes a copy of the motion as delivered to Franklin by the Earl of Chatham.¹⁶

The Williams report was unknown until 1949, when Bernhard Knollenberg edited the manuscript. Knollenberg surmised that Williams, as a confidant of Quincy, knew of the dispatch of his report to America, and as a familiar was aware of Franklin's understandable desire for caution; consequently the letter was never dispatched, but retained by its author in England.¹⁷ The exact provenance of the document is undetermined. Williams certainly intended to send his letter from London on January 26,¹⁸ and while Quincy and Williams were together much at this time, Quincy did not record the reading of his report of the debate until March 3. In any event, Quincy secured the honor of historical priority, and Williams sank into undeserved obscurity.

Perhaps the apparent failure of Chatham's efforts tended to discourage notice of the motion of January 20, for other known private accounts are quite brief: Basil Williams noted but four other such sources of information. The Marquis of Rockingham

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 2nd ed., 418; Smyth, *Franklin*, VI, 445-446. Quincy's diary is also in Massachusetts Historical Society *Proceedings*, L (1916-17), 456-461 and *passim*.

¹⁶ MS in the Indiana University Library, Bloomington, Ind.

¹⁷ Bernhard Knollenberg, *Franklin, Jonathan Williams, and William Pitt* (Bloomington, 1949), 20.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 19.

casually mentioned the outcome of the event, but his marked dissatisfaction with Chatham's course of action prohibited either enthusiasm or effective support.¹⁹ Charles, Baron Cathcart described the speech to his son in a letter of January 21, but the printed notice is of no value whatsoever.²⁰ Horace Walpole, on the other hand, left a concise summary of the debate and numerous pithy comments in his letters and journals.²¹ Walpole's reportorial enthusiasm was waning in 1775, however, and after relating his tale to his favorite correspondents, he fell back upon the newspapers which, he observed, "now are very accurate in recounting debates."²² While useful, Horace Walpole's contribution is not of primary importance in establishing the text of Chatham's speech. Among the lesser reporters may be named Thomas, Lord Lyttelton, who also spoke in the course of the January 20 debate. Lyttelton left an account of his own feeble efforts, but had nothing to say about Chatham's oration.²³ This account was not noticed by Basil Williams, nor was the report by Edmund Burke to a committee at Bristol written the very night of the debate. Burke's report is not particularly important, but has independent merit by virtue of its source and the harsh criticism of one who favored the American cause though not Chatham's solution of the problem. Burke also commented briefly on the outcome of the debate in a letter of January 20 addressed to John Hely Hutchinson.²⁴ On the day following Chatham's speech, Lord Hillsborough rendered "a full account" of the proceedings to former Governor of Massachusetts Thomas Hutchinson, but

¹⁹ Earl of Albemarle, ed., *Memoirs of the Marquis of Rockingham* (London, 1852), II, 264-267.

²⁰ Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Second Report*, App., 29.

²¹ A. F. Steuart, ed., *Last Journals of Horace Walpole* (London, 1910), I, 420-422; P. Toynbee, ed., *Letters of Horace Walpole* (Oxford, 1903-18), IX, 148-163.

²² Toynbee, *Letters*, IX, 163.

²³ T. Frost, *Life of Thomas Lord Lyttelton* (London, 1876), 160-162.

²⁴ Earl Fitzwilliam and R. Bourke, eds., *Correspondence of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke* (London, 1844), II, 11-14; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *12th Report*, App., Pt. IX, 282.

Hutchinson left no more than a report of the division in his diary.²⁵

These commentaries, ten in all, appear to make up the presently available private reports of the speech. Additions to the number may be found, but that non-professional reports would add greatly to our knowledge of the debate is at best doubtful. However, in this category lie five of Basil Williams' eleven sources. Two of these, Cathcart and Rockingham, are of no significance, but two of the commentaries unnoticed by the biographer, Quincy's and Jonathan Williams', add materially to the description of the speech. We are then left virtually dependent upon these private American sources and Horace Walpole who, like Benjamin Franklin, dropped the subject with the advice to his readers to see their daily newspapers for further information.

II. *Contemporary Newspapers, Periodicals, and Pamphlets*

The preliminaries of the American Revolution enjoyed a publicity unmatched by earlier crises in English history, for the middle years of the eighteenth century witnessed a remarkable expansion of the English press in both its physical capacity and journalistic achievement. By the second decade of the reign of George III, the newspapers of London were fairly reputable sources of information eagerly perused by king and commoner alike. In 1771, the City and the publishers won a notable victory over the traditional secrecy of Parliament, and by 1775, speeches of members of both Houses were usually accorded whatever treatment their style and content deserved. The monthly magazine also served a useful rôle in the summarization of news and frequently became an important organ of factional propaganda. Source of much of the material that filled newspapers and magazines, the one-shilling pamphlet was still the recognized voice of politics. Its length made possible elaboration of argument (and perfection

²⁵ P. O. Hutchinson, ed., *Diary and Letters of Thomas Hutchinson* (Boston, 1884), 358.

of prose) unsuited to its rivals. The public bought pamphlets with eagerness and read them with avidity. Whereas newspapers enjoyed a most ephemeral existence, the pamphlet survived the first or second reading and was frequently retained in the purchaser's private library.

In America the same characteristics prevailed in the field of journalism, but production was complicated by the problem of securing news across the stormy Atlantic. The story of trans-oceanic news dissemination has yet to be written, but available evidence shows that the American publisher who sought to keep abreast of English affairs maintained fairly regular, if unofficial, contacts with American political agents, visitors, and fellow publishers in London. Transference of news was dependent chiefly upon wind and wave. The voyage from England might take from five to eight weeks, but the latest papers and pamphlets from the mother-country were sure to be found on every westbound ship.²⁶ The bonds of Anglo-American journalism were a very real factor in the life of the first British Empire.

It was in the contemporary political press that the public first became acquainted with Chatham's speech of January 20; it was to this source that the eighteenth-century critics and commentators directed their correspondents for further enlightenment.

The Earl of Chatham's purpose in offering the motion to withdraw Gage's troops from Boston was by no means destroyed when the Lords divided against him. He proposed to open the road to reconciliation by evoking the force of public opinion, and his son observed of the speech that "though it had not the desired effect on an obdurate House of Lords, it must have an infinite effect without doors."²⁷ Horace Walpole also recognized that Chatham aimed his shaft at "the clamorous side, which no doubt will become the popular side too."²⁸ As the success of the effort de-

²⁶ Clarence S. Brigham, *Journals and Journeymen* (Philadelphia, 1950), 55-59.

²⁷ *Chatham Corr.*, IV, 392.

²⁸ Toynbee, *Letters*, IX, 153.

pended upon the support given by the press, it is somewhat astonishing that Chatham made no effort to publicize his ideas.

Notice of the day's proceedings first appeared in the *Gazetteer* and the *London Chronicle* of January 21. These papers printed only the motion, but on Monday, January 23, the *Gazetteer* provided the first version of Chatham's speech to reach the public. The account was full and did justice to the sentiments as well as the principles of the speaker.²⁹ While bearing some similarity to other versions of the speech, the "Authentic Extracts" of the *Gazetteer* deserve to be considered an independent public source of primary importance.

The *London Chronicle* was the second newspaper to present its readers with Chatham's speech. On January 24, the *Chronicle* published a brief summary which lapsed only occasionally into oratorical reporting, and admitted that "it would be doing great injustice to his Lordship's oratory, judgment, and observation, to attempt following him."³⁰ Though scarcely half as long as the *Gazetteer* report, that of January 24 is an important check upon other current versions of the speech and was immediately dispatched to North America, where it was widely copied. Its shortcomings, however, were recognized by the publishers who soon presented yet another form of Chatham's address to their readers.

In the days immediately following Chatham's speech, the London publisher George Kearsley prepared a pamphlet which, under ordinary circumstances, would have presented the address to the world in its best-known form. Drawn from notes and suggestions provided by an anonymous correspondent whom Kearsley described as a "distinguished character, a Friend to the public Cause," "a very respectable member of Parliament," and "an ardent admirer" of Lord Chatham,³¹ this new version was in-

²⁹ *The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, Jan. 23, 1775, "Authentic Extracts from the most material Parts of the Several Speeches, delivered in the — of — on Friday night."

³⁰ *London Chronicle*, XXXVII (January 24, 1775), 78.

³¹ Chatham Papers, P. R. O., 30/8, Bundle 47.

tended to be definitive as well as lucrative for its publisher. The pamphlet was advertised in several papers and published about January 24.³² The text was at once seized upon by the press. The *London Chronicle* noticed that "Some parts of the Earl's speech having already appeared in the News papers" were inaccurate, and consequently justified the reprinting of a major portion of Kearsley's pamphlet which had initially appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*.³³ Further than this the London papers did not go, for the Earl of Chatham was extremely displeased at the representation of his speech published by George Kearsley. The Earl demanded that the pamphlet be withdrawn, and exerted severe pressure upon the newspapers and publishers to secure their acquiescence in his formal public denunciation of the report. This was accomplished by January 27 to the Earl's satisfaction. Apparently the publishers were advised to walk softly, not only by Chatham's intervention but by the original publisher, who was threatened with prosecution by his Lordship "to the Utmost that the Law allows."³⁴ In denouncing Kearsley's pamphlet Chatham described it as "entirely spurious"—precisely the description given by Franklin, who undoubtedly accepted the lead of the Earl and the London newspapers. Franklin soon forgot his repudiation of the journalistic effort as did George Kearsley himself. Some time after January, Kearsley published a pamphlet which purported to be "A New Edition" of the earlier report. Despite the suggestion of revision, this "New Edition" was merely the old pamphlet with a new title page; the original text was in no way changed. It was, on the contrary, rapidly circulated throughout the British Empire by Kearsley's fellow-publishers. The Londoner, T. Freeman, brought it out with only slight change of title page, and it was incorporated in the widely distributed *History of American*

³² The advertisement with the vague phrase "*This day is published*" appears in *Lloyd's Evening Post*, Jan. 23-25, the *Morning Post*, Jan. 25, and the *Gazetteer*, Jan. 26.

³³ *Morning Chronicle*, Jan. 25; *London Chronicle*, Jan. 24-26.

³⁴ On the outcome of the affair see the author's "The Earl of Chatham and the London Press, 1775," *Journalism Quarterly*, XXXI (1954), 186ff.

Taxation which was published in London by James Dodsley, and in Dublin by Thomas Walker and C. Jenkin, and also by John Exshaw, Thomas Ewing and Elizabeth Lynch. Combining the imperial discussions of both Chatham and Edmund Burke, *The History of American Taxation* ran to at least a fourth edition, revised and corrected with additions, which is sufficient indication of its great popularity and sale.

The Gentleman's Magazine reprinted a portion of the Kearsley pamphlet, but, like the newspapers, cut short its report for reasons of policy.³⁵ *The Scots Magazine*, on the other hand, took its version of the debate from the columns of the *London Chronicle*.³⁶

In 1775 only one publication was flourishing that attempted to present the debates of Parliament fully. John Almon's *Parliamentary Register* was a work quite comparable to the later publications of Cobbett and Hansard. Almon had his own sources of information, and frequently members of Parliament themselves supplied him with speeches.³⁷ In the case of Chatham's speech Almon rejected the Kearsley report and printed an independent version.³⁸ This account has little merit as a finished piece of oratory; it is obviously a hasty printing of notes taken in the heat of presentation, but therein lies its real value as a check upon other more rhetorical reports. Like Kearsley's, Almon's version found wide circulation. In 1786, John Stockdale wrested it from the *Parliamentary Register* and with some minor changes reprinted it in *The Beauties of the British Senate*,³⁹ a collection of notable speeches. Some years later it was restored in a re-issue of the *Parliamentary Register* by Stockdale, and from one of these sources passed into William Cobbett's *Parliamentary History* as a secondary account of the day's proceedings.⁴⁰

³⁵ *The Gentleman's Magazine*, XLV (Jan. 1775), 7-8.

³⁶ *The Scots Magazine*, XXXVII (Feb. 1775), 81-82.

³⁷ *Memoirs of John Almon* (London, 1790), 120-121.

³⁸ *Parliamentary Register* (London, J. Stockdale, 1802), II, 5-15.

³⁹ II, 91-96.

⁴⁰ W. Cobbett, ed., *The Parliamentary History of England* (London, 1813), XVIII, 149ff.

Among the anonymous reporters of the debate only one has been clearly identified—Hugh Macaulay Boyd, whose report of Chatham's speech has been assumed definitive in one or another of its several forms. Boyd's ability to reconstruct Chatham's speech "with an exactness unusual in the recital of publick debates" may be granted, but even his stoutest supporter admitted that the account was not perfect, inasmuch as Boyd preferred to give "an incomplete rather than a spurious likeness." Historians using the report have been embarrassed by its abrupt beginning. Boyd is supposed to have entered the House of Lords only after "Lord Chatham had been speaking for some time," and since he "unfortunately did not hear," he "would not presume to supply" the early portion of the speech.⁴¹

So much for the admitted weakness of the Boyd report as it is found in its recognized forms. It has been held that this report first appeared in 1779, after Chatham's death, in a pamphlet published for James Dodsley entitled *Genuine Abstracts from Two Speeches of the Late Earl of Chatham*. From this source it was included in John Almon's *Anecdotes of the Life of the Right Honourable William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* and Lawrence Dundas Campbell's *Miscellaneous Works of Hugh Boyd*, and has been utilized by historians since that time without question.

Only when Chatham's speech is tracked across the Atlantic does the weakness of time-honored authority suggest itself, and a revaluation of sources become necessary. This westward progress may be illustrated from the correspondence of the Bristol merchant Richard Champion. Word of Chatham's motion and defeat reached Bristol by January 22, and Champion at once dispatched the news to his mercantile associates Willing, Morris & Co., of Philadelphia.⁴² Within a couple of days the speech was

⁴¹ L. D. Campbell, *The Miscellaneous Works of Hugh Boyd* (London, 1800), I, 247-249. Basil Williams declared Boyd's report to be one among very few "exact accounts" of a Chatham speech: *Life of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (London, 1913), II, 336.

⁴² G. H. Guttridge, ed., *The American Correspondence of a Bristol Merchant* (Berkeley, 1934), 40-41.

public property, and London newspapers and pamphlets were being added to parcels destined for the ports of America. The season was stormy and passage slow. Not until April did American publishers receive their consignments and present Chatham's speech to the American public.

The London *Chronicle* of January 24 was the source of information for Thomas and John Fleet's *Boston Evening Post* (April 10), and for John Dixon and William Hunter's *Virginia Gazette* (April 15). Frederick Green at Annapolis barely noticed the January 20 proceedings in *The Maryland Gazette* of April 20, 1775.

British newspapers served some colonial publishers, but the Philadelphians William Bradford and John Dunlap received George Kearsley's pamphlet version of the speech. Bradford published the report in two issues of the *Pennsylvania Journal* (April 12 and 19), and Dunlap followed suit in his *Pennsylvania Packet* on April 17 and 19.⁴³ From these papers the Kearsley version apparently found its way into the columns of the *North Carolina Gazette* and perhaps other colonial papers.⁴⁴

Thus far American and British information was the same, and, according to the author of the speech, equally erroneous. In England the published version was condemned, though not withdrawn, and attention moved to other matters. However on May 1, 1775, John Dunlap announced that

*Next Friday [May 7] will be published . . . LORD CHATHAM'S SPEECH in the House of Lords, on the 20th of January, 1775.—The copies of this Speech hitherto published are spurious; but this may be depended upon as the genuine Speech of that noble Lord, as it was sent here by a Gentleman of the first character in England.*⁴⁵

The promise of a "genuine" speech was eventually fulfilled, for

⁴³ On Dunlap see Alfred M. Lee, "Dunlap and Claypool: Printers and Newsmerchants of the Revolution," *Journalism Quarterly*, XI (1934), 160ff.

⁴⁴ Additional reprintings are indicated by the survival of pamphlets in the New York Public Library and the John Carter Brown Library which contain the Kearsley text, but fail to indicate place, date, or name of publisher.

⁴⁵ *Pennsylvania Packet*, May 1, 1775.

on Monday, June 9, Dunlap advertised his pamphlet as "*Just published.*" Again he emphasized that his account had been "Sent over in Manuscript from a Gentleman of distinction in London to his friend in this city."⁴⁶

John Dunlap's pamphlet circulated widely, though the scarcity of surviving copies suggests a relatively small printing. Isaiah Thomas reproduced the speech in the *Massachusetts Spy* of Worcester on December 15, 1775, and James Davis of Newbern reprinted the pamphlet for circulation in North Carolina.⁴⁷ In addition to these reproductions of the Dunlap pamphlet, it was translated and published by Henry Miller, a patriotic German-American printer, as *Des Hoch-Edlen Grafen von Chatham REDE* (Philadelphia, 1775).⁴⁸ A single surviving copy of one other form of the Dunlap pamphlet is found in the British Museum. It is a broadsheet which bears the identification "LANCASTER. Printed by H. Walmsley," and appears to have been contemporary with Dunlap's publication.

The Dunlap pamphlet has long been known but incorrectly described. Both Sabin and Evans confused the Dunlap version with that published by George Kearsley, and it has been lumped together with the latter as a "spurious" account.⁴⁹ It is, on the contrary, a unique production bearing no generic relation to Kearsley's effort but most intimately associated with the Boyd version

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, June 9, 1775. The advertisement was repeated on June 19, 1775.

⁴⁷ Advertised as "Just published" in the *North-Carolina Gazette*, June 30, 1775: D. C. McMurtrie, *Eighteenth Century North Carolina Imprints 1749-1800* (Chapel Hill, 1938).

⁴⁸ Miller offered his pamphlet as a premium for readers of his *Staatsbote* who would pay their subscriptions within a year. See C. F. Dapp, "The Evolution of an American Patriot," *The Pennsylvania-German Society Proceedings*, XXXII (1924), 43.

⁴⁹ Joseph Sabin, *A Dictionary of Books Relating to America* (New York, 1868-1936), XV, 153, describes the Dunlap pamphlet (No. 63077) as a reprint of Kearsley's (No. 63076). Sabin also lists the Freeman pamphlet noticed above as No. 63075. Charles Evans, *American Bibliography* (Chicago, 1903-34), V, 184, lists Dunlap (No. 14405) without comment, the unidentified New York Public Library pamphlet mentioned above (No. 14406), and Miller's translation (No. 14407), with the erroneous comment that "This speech was disclaimed by the Earl of Chatham."

heretofore presumed to have been first published in 1779. It includes virtually all of Boyd's *Genuine Abstracts* speech, plus two pages introductory to that version which may represent the opening of Chatham's speech which Boyd is supposed to have missed. It further reproduces two significant passages omitted from the Dodsley pamphlet, probably because of their strong American bias. As the sentiments expressed therein, and also the language utilized, are verified in other sources, there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of Dunlap's *Speech*.

In view of the publisher's statements and the bibliographical evidence, it appears that something like the following sequence of events occurred. George Kearsley's pamphlet was published about January 24, and was at once bitterly condemned by the Earl of Chatham. On January 27, Kearsley made his public retraction, and it was evident to every London publisher that the matter was too touchy to pursue with safety. At that point James Dodsley found himself possessed of Boyd's manuscript which was useless under the circumstances in England. An American publisher, however, would not be intimidated by the noble Lord's authority and might use the manuscript with impunity. Without further ado, for a copy of the manuscript was in Dunlap's hands less than a month after the first reports of the speech reached Philadelphia, the account was forwarded to America. The "Gentleman of distinction," he "of the first character," was undoubtedly a leading London publisher, or one of the numerous Americans who maintained close contacts with the English press. Unfortunately the extant papers of John Dunlap do not disclose the name of his informant, but publish he did, and four years prior to James Dodsley's vaunted *Genuine Abstracts*.

In 1779, after Chatham's death, numerous eulogies of the Earl appeared in London bookshops. As a means of tapping the market, Dodsley must have bethought himself of Boyd's report, lying unexploited on some dusty shelf. Chatham could not now object to the publication of his speech; the manuscript was duly

uncovered, but during the intervening years the first page had been lost. Rather than discard it altogether, Dodsley concocted the tale of Boyd's late arrival, excused his carelessness, and published a mutilated version of the speech. Here lies the charge of deception—against James Dodsley, and not George Kearsley who only published the best account he could secure. Happily the worthy Dodsley can be convicted from his own publications. In 1776 he published the *Annual Register* for 1775, in which Chatham's speech was briefly summarized in two columns. The organization, phraseology, and the one brief quotation risked by the publisher are from the Boyd report, and from that version of the speech prior to its emasculation in the *Genuine Abstracts*.⁵⁰ One further support may be added to the case. Dodsley, Campbell, and their followers declared that Boyd arrived too late to hear Chatham's opening remarks: a plausible excuse. It should be noted, however, that the House of Lords was so crowded on January 20, that those who secured a place considered themselves quite fortunate, and the very bar of the House was "crowded with Americans."⁵¹ If Boyd had arrived late, it is likely that he would have been quite unable to secure any place whatsoever. As he did hear and report the speech, he probably arrived early, heard Chatham through, and suffered in fame by the fault of others.

III. Collections, Collations, etc.

A third and final category of sources for Chatham's speech was established by Prof. Basil Williams. He listed four later works from which he drew material: Francis Thackeray's *History of the Right Honourable William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (London, 1827); Henry Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution in America* (Baltimore, 1822); William S. Taylor and John H. Pringle, *Correspondence of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (London, 1840); and George Bancroft's *History of the United States* (2nd ed., Bos-

⁵⁰ *Annual Register* (1775), pp. 47-48.

⁵¹ *Chatham Corr.*, IV, 376.

ton, 1858). The value of these accounts may be dealt with shortly, as none is of any independent merit. Niles presents the Dunlap version of the speech (pp. 211-215); Thackeray reprints Boyd's report (II, 281) with proper scholarly reference to both the *Genuine Abstracts* and *Miscellaneous Works*. The *Chatham Correspondence* copies the *Genuine Abstracts* with numerous errors (IV, 377-384), and George Bancroft's rendition of Chatham's oratory (VII, 196-201) was derived from the same source.

In direct line of scholarly succession, Albert Von Ruville, *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (London, 1907), III, 290-292; Basil Williams, *Life*, II, 305 (with slight interpolation from the secret French report); and Brian Tunstall, *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (London, 1938), 450-452—Chatham's most recent serious biographers—have adhered to the account attributed to Hugh Boyd and derived from the English sources.

The bibliographical pursuit of Chatham's speech thus indicates a far greater amount of material available to the parliamentary historian than has heretofore been recognized. It is quite evident that dependence need not be placed upon accounts such as Boyd's merely because they have been declared authoritative. In fact, Boyd's version, as it has been used by the great majority of writers, is neither complete nor perfect; its proper form and first appearance is found in John Dunlap's obscure Philadelphia pamphlet from which the charge of "spurious" may now be removed. In this priority of American publication may also be seen one of the first fruits of that freedom for which Chatham spoke so eloquently and the tribute of the American press to America's greatest friend in the British Parliament.

The Authorship and Printing of *Plain Truth* by "Candidus"

By THOMAS R. ADAMS*

ON January 9, 1776, the Philadelphia printer Robert Bell placed on sale one of the most dynamic pieces of political propaganda ever offered to American readers. Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* brought to a culmination the "War of the Pamphlets," that literary outpouring of ten years in which all the issues in conflict between Great Britain and the colonies had been debated. Paine offered nothing new, but he brought tensions into focus and reduced the struggle from theoretical constitutional problems to a simple plan of action. *Common Sense* was the first decisive step toward independence, the first of that succession of events which were to follow one upon another from January to the crisis in July 1776.

There was little left to be said and still less time left in which to say it. It was scarcely surprising, therefore, that only two pamphlet-answers to *Common Sense* appeared; even less surprising that they had but slight effect.¹ They were answers, nevertheless, and deserve to be noticed. Both were printed in Philadelphia.² The two tracts, which appeared anonymously, were:

* The author wishes to thank Mr. John H. Powell for his assistance in the preparation of the text of this article.

¹ Provost William Smith also endeavored to reply in a series of letters signed "Cato" which appeared principally in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, but except for the reprinting of one of them in *Plain Truth* they received no separate publication.

² A third pamphlet, *The Deceiver Unmasked; or, Loyalty and Interest United: in Answer to a Pamphlet Entitled Common Sense*, was printed by Samuel Loudon in New York, but it was never sold because a Committee of Mechanics under Christopher Duyckinck destroyed almost all of the 1,500 copies. See Alexander J. Wall, "The Burning of the Pamphlet 'The Deceiver Unmasked' in 1776," *The American Collector*, III (1926), 106-111.

Plain Truth; Addressed to the Inhabitants of America, Containing, Remarks on a Late Pamphlet, Entitled Common Sense . . . By Candidus, published by Robert Bell on March 13th; and *The True Interest of America Impartially Stated in Certain Strictures on a Pamphlet Intitled Common Sense*, published by James Humphreys on May 29th.³

The author of *The True Interest* has long been known to be the Reverend Charles Inglis of Trinity Church, New York, a loyalist who later became the first Anglican Bishop of Nova Scotia. The identity of "Candidus," however, has been the subject of much speculation. At the time of publication, an angry mob accused one Richard Wells of Philadelphia of being the author, but Wells publicly denied it. In 1792, Thomas Jefferson assumed that Alexander Hamilton had written *Plain Truth*,⁴ and at various times the names of Inglis, Joseph Galloway and George Chalmers have been offered. A century later, Paul Leicester Ford fixed upon Provost William Smith of the College of Philadelphia.⁵ His attribution was a dubious one and his argument highly speculative, but his conclusions were generally accepted. He was in error. The true author was Lieutenant-Colonel James Chalmers, a landowner in Kent County on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. He admitted responsibility in 1796, when he attacked another of Paine's writings in a signed pamphlet entitled, *Strictures on a Pamphlet Written by Thomas Paine on the English System of Finance*.⁶ Here he specifically refers to *Plain Truth* by title as his answer to *Common Sense*. Thus there can be no confusing it with the many other eighteenth-century

³ All dates of publication given in this article are based on advertisements found in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*.

⁴ *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Elery Bergh, Washington (1903-04), "Anas," I, 324.

⁵ "The Authorship of 'Plain Truth,'" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XII (1888), 421-424.

⁶ The only copies of this pamphlet that I have been able to locate are the second edition with the imprint: London Re-printed for J. Debrett, 1796. Paine's work on English Finance appeared in 1796, and so the first edition of Chalmers' answer must also have appeared in that year.

tracts of the same title. Apparently Chalmers also claimed authorship before the commission of enquiry into the claims of loyalists.⁷ There can no longer be any doubt of the true identity of "Candidus," for not only has James Chalmers claimed credit; no one has ever put forward a counter-claim. Perhaps it is strange that this information, which has so long been in the public domain, should have been overlooked.⁸ The explanation probably lies in a confusion with George Chalmers, the loyalist historian of the Revolution from Maryland. It is clear that this more famous Chalmers could not have written *Plain Truth*, for by 1776 he had already left America.⁹ But probably, when the name Chalmers was mentioned, writers mistakenly assumed that the reference was to the better-known of the two men, and dismissed the matter without going into it more carefully.¹⁰

James Chalmers, a Scotsman by birth, emigrated to the West Indies at an early age. In 1760 he removed to Philadelphia, and later to Kent County, Maryland, where he acquired large land holdings. Although offered a commission in the "Rebel Army," he instead raised and commanded the Maryland Loyalist Regiment which took part in the Battle of Germantown. Following the war, he went first to Canada and later to London, where he died on October 4, 1806. It was this comparatively little-known man who in the last months of passion and violence before the Declaration of Independence attempted to oppose the times in the first answer to *Common Sense*.¹¹

By the beginning of 1776 the men who most vigorously resist-

⁷ Grace Amelia Cockroft, *The Public Life of George Chalmers*. New York, Columbia University Press, [1939], 40-41, footnote.

⁸ My attention was drawn to both Chalmers' second pamphlet and Miss Cockroft's note by an alert cataloguer in the Yale University Library, who recorded both of them on the card in the main catalogue.

⁹ Cockroft, *op. cit.*, 44.

¹⁰ I suspect that this error was first made by Paul Leicester Ford in the article mentioned above.

¹¹ Most of the information on Chalmers is to be found scattered through *The Maryland Historical Magazine*. In particular: II (1902), 135; V (1910), 196-197; IX (1914), 260, 366; XVIII (1923), 301.

ed the excesses of the radical patriots were silent.¹² Events were moving too fast. The Continental Congress, sitting continuously since May of 1775, found itself in an ambivalent position. It had its armies in Canada and before Boston; it was behaving like the government of a sovereign state. Yet still it was waiting the result of its humble address to the Crown, and many of the silenced moderates were looking hopefully to the Peace Commissioners recently provided by Britain. There was still a chance for reconciliation, if only reason and patience could prevail on both sides.

Common Sense was not written to encourage either of these virtues. Within the year it went through nineteen editions in the colonies and seven in Great Britain, and a French translation was published in Rotterdam. Despite its title, thoughtful Philadelphians found little in it that appealed to anyone's sense, common or uncommon. It set out to demolish all that remained of 170 years of Anglo-American political ties. In their place, Paine offered his own plan of government, so radical that even John Adams drew back from it. But events were entering their popular phase. *Common Sense* offered the philosophy of enlightenment from such writers as Montesquieu and Locke, in a simply-worked-out plan of action which all could understand. Paine argued that the resources of the colonies were great enough to defeat any force which Britain might send, and that the whole nature of the British monarchy and constitution was so corrupt that the only solution to the conflict would be immediate and complete separation.

He struck a blow at the whole structure which the moderates had endeavored to build. John Dickinson and his followers had come to accept independence as probably inevitable. To them, the most important consideration was the maintenance of stable and effective governmental institutions under which order would

¹² Philip Davidson, *Propaganda and the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, [1941], 302-303.

be assured and private property protected. Provisions for such government must be made, and then, if Britain continued intransigent, independence could be declared with the assurance that the new nation would be in responsible hands.

Plain Truth, the first answer to Paine's *Common Sense*, has long been regarded as a weak and ineffectual presentation of either the loyalist or the moderate side. Moses Coit Tyler, in his *Literary History of the American Revolution*, gave it a bad reputation from which it has never recovered. He spoke of the "intellectual poverty of its actual contents,—its lack of order, its feebleness in argument, its garrulity, its dismal attempts at humor, its bad grammar, its pitiful failure to perform what it announces as its purpose to perform." Because of this criticism—primarily a literary one—later writers have neglected *Plain Truth*, and in doing so have neglected an important part of the story of the fight for independence. Certainly Tyler's excoriation of the literary merits of *Plain Truth* is in some measure deserved. Chalmers was no stylist. He leaves sentences unfinished, and permits lines of argument to appear, disappear and reappear in great disorder. Yet the publication of *Plain Truth* on March 13 was followed on April 17 with *Additions to Plain Truth* by the same author, and on May 8 Bell brought out both pamphlets together in a second edition. In the same year, 1776, James Almon brought out *Common Sense* and *Plain Truth* together in four London editions, and M. Mills published one in Dublin. By contrast, Charles Inglis's *The True Interest* (traditionally regarded by historians as a much more effectual reply to *Common Sense*) did not appear until nine days before Richard Henry Lee actually introduced his resolution for independence in the Congress. Clearly, Inglis's pamphlet came too late to play any part in shaping opinion. And just as clearly, James Chalmers' work was the most important American expression of the views of those whom Paine had so violently attacked—and the only American expression of those views known to Englishmen.

Parts of *Plain Truth* belong to the best traditions of eighteenth-century rhetoric. The author was watching fearfully as his whole way of life was being destroyed. Many men were in despair as they saw what Provost Smith called "a fabric built up with so much care by our ancestors, cemented with so much blood" threatened by the horrors of civil war. The outrageous *Common Sense* had gone unanswered for over two months, so Chalmers, ill at ease with the pen as he was, came forward to combat its distortions.

In undertaking the publication of the pamphlet, Robert Bell must have anticipated trouble. He had just finished a dispute with Paine and the printers William and Thomas Bradford over the second edition of *Common Sense*, and he seems to have been ready for further attacks. On the first page of all editions of *Plain Truth* appears his essay, "The Printer to the Public on the Freedom of the Press." Bell was an enterprising businessman, and he pleaded for the right to present both sides of the question. No doubt he hoped thereby to increase the sales of both pamphlets.¹³

We shall probably never know all the difficulties under which the printer had to operate. Certainly a publisher who put his name to a pamphlet such as *Plain Truth* would evoke the wrath of a very vocal part of the population. Such evidence as we have would not justify the assertion that Bell was actually under direct pressure while publishing Chalmers' tract, but the months of March and April were hectic times for anyone involved in political affairs, and Bell's printing press was deeply involved.

¹³ The story that a New York printing of *Plain Truth* by Samuel Loudon was destroyed by a mob is, I feel, a dubious one. It is based on a notation in Jefferson's "Anas" (for November 19, 1792) of information he got secondhand from Loudon via Melancthon Smith sixteen years after the event. Wall in his description of *The Deceiver Unmasked* (sup., n. 2.) states that the destruction of the pamphlet took place on March 19—just six days after the first publication of *Plain Truth* in Philadelphia. It would seem unlikely that Loudon would attempt an edition of *Plain Truth*, another anti-*Common Sense* pamphlet, so soon after his unpleasant experience. It would be much more likely that in the re-telling so many years later the two pamphlets were confused.

Soon after *Plain Truth* was issued, he published on April 24 a Philadelphia edition of Jacob Green's *Observations on the Reconciliation of Great Britain and the Colonies*. His political publishing had put a strain on the operations of his shop. To print *Common Sense*, Bell had had to cull his warehouse for decent paper; and by the time he got to the *Additions to Plain Truth* and Green's *Observations*, he was reduced to using a cheap blue paper for which he felt obliged to apologize. It is not surprising, therefore, to discover that *Plain Truth*, issued in exciting times and under a good deal of difficulty, fails to conform to any known printing pattern. The problems of editions, issues, and states present a bibliographical puzzle that cannot be solved in terms of ordinary printing practice. The only way they can be understood is against the background of the tension and confusion that prevailed.

Plain Truth contains, in addition to the main body of text, an extract from William Smith's second letter, signed "Cato," which in later editions appears in its entirety; and an essay signed "Rationalis," the author of which I have not been able to identify. *The Additions to Plain Truth* was sold both separately and with the original pamphlet. However, for purposes of this discussion, they will be treated as part of *Plain Truth*.

The pamphlet is made up of twelve or eighteen signatures, depending upon whether or not the *Additions* are present. They are: [A], B-M, χ , N-P, [Q-R] and are gatherings of fours in octavo foldings. The problems break down into ten units: [A], B-K (excluding I), I, L, M, χ , N, O, P and [Q-R]. The clearest way to discuss the problem is to consider each of the units individually; next, their various combinations.

SIGNATURE [A]

This signature presents the most perplexing problem, for it alone was printed in four different states. Close examination reveals that they were all printed from essentially the same setting of type and the variations are the result of stop-press corrections on but two of the pages. They are:

A2^r, the title-page, and A4^v, the last page of the signature. The title-page was printed as part of the inner forme and the last page was printed as part of the outer forme, so that the variations cannot be explained in terms of alterations in one forme only. The four different states of the signature are described below in what I judge to be their chronological order.

State 1

A1^r (outer forme)

THE PRINTER TO THE PUBLIC: | On the FREEDOM of the
PRESS. | HAVING very lately, without any other authority, | than THE
LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, ushered | into the hands of the public,
certain speculations | FOR AMERICAN INDEPENDENCY. | [39
lines in all including the catchword.]

A1^v (inner forme)

Extract from MONSIEUR DE LOLME's ESSAY | *on the* English
Constitution, *recommended by* JUNIUS. | [21 lines including the above
caption title] | [rule] | LATELY PRINTED AND PUBLISHED, |
And now selling by ROBERT BELL, in | Third Street | COMMON
SENSE; | [12 lines including the above three]

A2^r (inner forme—the title-page)

PLAIN TRUTH; | ADDRESSED TO THE | INHABITANTS
| OF | AMERICA, | Containing, Remarks | ON A LATE PAM-
PHLET, | entitled | COMMON SENSE. | Wherein are shewn, that
the Scheme of INDEPENDENCE | is Ruinous, Delusive, and Im-
practicable: That were | the Author's Affeверations, Respecting the
Power of | AMERICA, as Real as Nugatory; Reconciliation on | lib-
eral Principles with GREAT BRITAIN, would be | exalted Policy:
And that circumstanced as we are, | Permanent Liberty, and True Hap-
piness, can only be | obtained by Reconciliation with that Kingdom. |
WRITTEN BY CANDIDUS. | Will ye turn from flattery, and at-
tend to this Side.? | [rule] | There TRUTH, unlicenc'd walks; and
dares accost | Even Kings themselves, the Monarchs of the Free! |
THOMSON on the Liberties of BRITAIN. | [rule] | PHILADEL-
PHIA: | Printed, and Sold, by R. BELL, in Third-Street. | [short rule]
| MDCCLXXVI.

A2^v (outer forme)

Blank.

A3^r (outer forme)

TO | JOHN DICKINSON, ESQUIRE; | [24 lines including caption-title and catchword]

A3^v (outer forme)

DEDICATION. | [A continuation of the Dedication to Dickinson, 21 lines including the running-title and catchword]

A4^r (inner forme)

INTRODUCTION. | [25 lines including caption title]

A4^v (outer forme)

[Rule] | MEMORANDUM. | Only a small number being Printed of this first Edition, | is one reason why it is retailed at no less than | THREE SHILLINGS. | N. B. Large Allowance to those who buy per the | Hundred or Dozen. | [5 additional lines] | [rule]

There are 11 lines of text altogether.

State 2

A1^r Same as state 1

A1^v Same as state 1

A2^r Same as state 1 except that a line of quotation from Horace has been inserted between lines 18 and 19 so that it reads thus:

WRITTEN BY CANDIDUS. | *Audi et alterem partem.* HORACE. | Will ye turn from flattery, and attend to this Side.? |

A2^v Same as state 1

A3^r Same as state 1

A3^v Same as state 1

A4^r Same as state 1

A4^v Blank

State 3

A1^r Same as state 1

A1^v Same as state 1

A2^r Same as state 1 except lines 17, 18 & 19 have been altered to read: | obtained, by HONORABLE CONNECTIONS, | with that Kingdom. | WRITTEN BY CANDIDUS. | Will ye turn from flattery, and attend to this Side.? |

The two lines from Thomson have been justified on the right and squeezed closer together, and the line from Horace has been removed.

A2^v Same as state 1

A3^r Same as state 1

A3^v Same as state 1

A4^r Same as state 1

A4^v The "Memorandum" in state 1 has been replaced, using the same setting of type, but between lines 4 and 5 twelve lines have been inserted. The reading in that part of the "Memorandum" is:

| THREE SHILLINGS. | Other reafons there are, viz. Treble price is charged | for Linen, and other Dry Goods. |

There are 23 lines including the caption-title.

State 4

A1^r Same as state 1

A1^v Same as state 1

A2^r Same as state 3 except that between lines 19 and 20 the statement of edition so that it reads:

| WRITTEN BY CANDIDUS. | [rule] | THE SECOND EDITION | [rule] | Will ye turn from flattery, and attend to this Side.? |

A2^v Same as state 1

A3^r Same as state 1

A3^v Same as state 1

A4^r Same as state 1

A4^v Same as state 3

In determining the chronological order of these four states, the title-page has been used as the controlling factor. This has been done because of the two variables, the title-page and the "Memorandum." The former had to be printed for each state and the latter did not; thus its omission in state 2 can be more easily explained. State 1 is clearly the first printing. First, because the wording in lines 17 and 18, which were altered in later states, is the one that appears in the first advertisement in

the *Pennsylvania Gazette* on March 13. Second, because in all copies examined, this state is always found with the earliest state of the body of the rest of the pamphlet. Third, because state 1 is never found with the *Additions* present.

State 4 is clearly the last one because of the appearance of "Second Edition" on the title-page and because it is found with the last state of the *Additions*.

The two intermediate states present more of a problem. State 2 has been placed second because the only alteration in the title-page was simply the insertion of the line from Horace, leaving the rest of the type undisturbed. State 3 has been placed third because the "Honorable Connections" insertion involved a more extensive alteration in the type than the change from state 1 to state 2, and the lines from Thomson were justified and squeezed together. Also there is a closer relationship between states 3 and 4 in that they both have the justified lines and the "Honorable Connections" reading.

If the above reasoning is sound, it becomes necessary to explain why the "Memorandum" of 11 lines appears in state 1, disappears in state 2 and then reappears in 23 lines in states 3 and 4. The alteration in the "Memorandum" seems to have been dictated by a desire further to justify the high price of the pamphlet. If we tried to work out a chronology based entirely on the "Memorandum," we would end up with an impossible title-page chronology. For instance, we would have Bell justifying the lines from Thomson and then undoing his work and justifying again. On the other hand, a plausible explanation can be made for the behavior of the "Memorandum."

Assuming that the outer forme was printed first, it would run something like this. While finishing the printing of the inner forme, containing the title-page, Bell removed the "Memorandum" from the outer forme, for its wording would indicate that it would not be needed in a second edition. Before going

further, the printer discovered that there was going to be a greater demand for the pamphlet, and so he put the outer forme back in the press without the "Memorandum." While this was going on, the inner forme was altered by the insertion of the Horace quotation in the title-page. When this second state of the inner forme was printed with the second state of the outer forme, state 2 of signature [A] would result. While the sheets of state 2 were being perfected from the inner forme, Bell found it necessary to expand the "Memorandum" on the outer forme. Apparently there was some criticism of the high price. As late as May 13, indeed, John Witherspoon published a letter in the *Pennsylvania Packet* under the pseudonym "Aristides," in which he complains about the high price of both *Plain Truth* and *Common Sense*. In the past the normal price of political pamphlets had been about one shilling, but as in all times of crisis prices were going up.

When this third state of the outer forme with the expanded "Memorandum" was in the press, the title-page in the inner forme was altered again, the quotation from Horace removed, the HONORABLE CONNECTIONS wording added, and the lines from Thomson justified. The new expression seems to be a more forceful statement of the author's sentiments. When this new alteration in the inner forme was perfecting on the second side of the sheets, we have state 3 of signature [A]. The change to state 4 simply involved the insertion of the words "second edition."

Whether this is the true explanation or not, something equally unusual must have occurred.

SIGNATURES B-K (excluding I)

The second unit presents a much simpler problem. A close line by line comparison shows one to be a resetting of the other. The differences are great enough to make it clear that the changes were not mere stop-press corrections. The most distinguishing variation is the caption title on B1^r.

State 1

B1^r caption title

[Double rule] | PLAIN TRUTH; | CONTAINING | REMARKS
ON A LATE PAMPHLET, ENTITLED, | COMMON SENSE.

The page numbering begins with "2" on B1^v and runs consecutively.

State 2

B1^r caption title

[Double rule] | PLAIN TRUTH; | CONTAINING, | REMARKS
ON A LATE PAMPHLET, | ENTITLED COMMON SENSE.

The page numbering begins with "10" on B1^v and runs consecutively, except for signatures I and L to be noted below.

The priority of state 1 in this case is established by the paging. The practice of starting the page numbering with the first page of text in the first setting of a manuscript, rather than with the title-page, is well known. Also in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania is a freak copy of the pamphlet, stitched and uncut without signature [A]; it is state 1. Apparently Bell allowed one copy out of the shop before the preliminary matter was off the press.

SIGNATURE I

This signature presents a problem that cannot be explained in terms of any known printing practice. It is the same throughout all known editions and issues. It was set as a part of the first printing, for its pagination fits into that sequence, and when it appears with later editions and issues, the paging of the whole pamphlet is interrupted. Bell either for some reason printed more of this signature than he needed, or the type for it was the last to be distributed; and before that was done he discovered that the demand for *Plain Truth* would be greater than he had anticipated, and so he allowed the type to stand without alteration. Bell states in the "Memorandum," in fact, that only a few copies of the first edition were printed. There is nothing textually in signature I to set it apart from the rest of the pamphlet and explain its special treatment.

SIGNATURE L

Signature L exists in two issues, the first appears when *Plain Truth* was issued alone and the second when the *Additions* are present.

State 1

The signature is in 3 leaves numbered 73-78, L1^r line 9 ends: *liber-*

State 2

The signature is in 4 leaves numbered 81-88, L1^r line 9 ends: *liberty*. L4^r begins: [double rule] | CATO's LETTER (*being his Second*) | to the People of PENNSYLVANIA.

SIGNATURE M

Signature M exists in two states and the differences are textual as well as typographical. Under ordinary circumstances state 2 appears only with the *Additions*; however, there is one possible exception in a mixed issue of the pamphlet.

State 1

M1^r

[Double rule] | EXTRACT *from the second Letter to the* | People of Pennsylvania; *being that part* | of it which relates to INDEPENDENCY. | By a WRITER under the Signature of | CATO.

The page numbering is [79], 80-84 and two unnumbered leaves of advertisements.

State 2

Contains the balance of the complete letter of "Cato's" which began on L4^r. At the bottom of M4^v is an advertisement for: *Simes Military Guide*. The page numbering is 89-96.

The first states of signatures L and M present a situation that requires special comment. It would have been most unusual for an eighteenth-century American printer to waste paper by printing only three leaves to a gathering, particularly Bell who, as has been noted, was having difficulty finding paper. Yet in all copies examined there are only seven leaves among signatures L and M. A disbound copy examined clearly shows that in signature L leaf L1 has no conjugate, and that L2 and L3, M1 and M4, M2 and M3 are conjugate. Here again pressure of time may explain the phenomenon. Signature M contains the "Extract from the second letter . . . of Cato" by Provost William Smith which first appeared in Hall and Sellers's *Pennsylvania Gazette* on March 13, the very day on which the first issue of *Plain Truth* was advertised to appear. The extract was lifted verbatim from the last half of the letter. We do not know whether Bell had access to the text before publication, or to an advance copy of the newspaper, or whether he delayed publication to insert the new material. In any case his shop must have been busy with last-minute alterations which might have produced the odd condition of signature L.

SIGNATURE X

Signature X, containing the title-page of the *Additions*, exists in only one state and appears in all issues and editions of the pamphlet. I have seen copies of the *Additions* alone in which X4 was folded around so that the title-page appears on the front of the pamphlet. Probably this was done when the *Additions* were issued separately and not sold as a part of *Plain Truth*.

X1^r

Extract, from the Journal of the proceedings, of the ho- | norable the American Continental Congress, held at | Philadelphia, September fifth 1774. Being that part | of their Address to the Inhabitants of the Province of | Quebec, which enumerates, the glorious RIGHTS of | Englishmen, and English subjects:

The text of this is contained on 1^r-3^v.

X4^r

ADDITIONS | TO | PLAIN TRUTH; | ADDRESSED TO THE | INHABITANTS | OF | AMERICA, | Containing, further Remarks | ON A LATE PAMPHLET, | entitled | COMMON SENSE: | WHEREIN, | Are clearly and fully shewn, that American Independence, | is as illusory, ruinous, and impracticable, as a liberal | reconciliation with Great Britain, is safe, honorable, | and expedient. | WRITTEN BY THE AUTHOR OF PLAIN TRUTH. | [rule] | [six lines from Montesquieu] | [rule] | PHILADELPHIA: | Printed, and Sold, by R. BELL, in Third-Street. | [short rule] | MDCC-LXXXVI.

4^v Blank.

SIGNATURE N

This signature exists in two states, and they are the result of a resetting of type. However, the most obvious difference is the blue paper upon which it is printed, which places state 2 second.

State 1

N3^r

In the last line of the footnote is the word: *smaller*.

State 2

N3^r

In the last line of the footnote is the word: *smaller*.

SIGNATURE O

This signature exists in three states, but the differences are all the result of stop-press corrections.

State 1

O₃^r

The footnote is 17 lines long, containing a quotation from Ferguson's *History of Civil Society*. The last line consists entirely of "barism," the second half of a hyphenated word.

State 2

O₃^r

The same as state 1, except that the paragraph now has quotation marks at the beginning and end. On the right-hand side of the page on the last line has been added: HISTORY OF CIVIL SOCIETY.

State 3

O₃^r

The paragraph is now divided in two, and the quotation marks are in their proper place around the quotation from Ferguson. HISTORY OF CIVIL SOCIETY has been inserted between the two paragraphs.

These three states seem to have resulted from an effort to print the footnote correctly. The first attempt omitted both the quotation marks and the source; the second put them in wrong, and on the third try the printer got them right.

SIGNATURE P

Signature P exists in two states.

State 1

P₂^v line 11 ends: currency

State 2

P₂^v line 11 ends: "curren-"

The second state is printed on blue paper and has a small printed label in which Bell apologizes for the use of the poor grade of paper. It is dated April 24, which means that the blue paper was not used until a week after the first publication of the *Additions*, but two weeks before the announcement of the second edition.

SIGNATURES [Q-R]

These signatures, unsigned, and numbered 121-136, are the same throughout all states of the pamphlet.

In the following chart have been set down the various combinations in each of the units described above. This chart is based on the study of some thirty copies in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Library Company of Philadelphia, the Library of Congress, the New York Public Library, the University of Pennsylvania Library, the Yale University Library, the Philip H. and A. S. W. Rosenbach Foundation, and of copies which the American Antiquarian Society kindly sent to Philadelphia for my inspection. In all but one of the cases I have seen a mint or near mint copy of the issues described, so that I feel sure that it was not an imperfect or made-up copy.

What we have, then, are seven different variants of *Plain Truth* printed by Robert Bell between March 13 and May 8, 1776. I believe that we can safely call "I" the first issue of the first edition. There is nothing present to invalidate the bibliographical assumption that an issue of a book in which the pagination begins on the first page of text precedes one in which it begins with the preliminary matter. With equal safety I believe we can call "VII" the last printing and the second edition, for it so declares itself.

The rest of the printings present a more difficult problem. They are all variants of the first edition and are of two types, the ones with the *Additions* and the ones without. We know that the *Additions* were issued separately, but, as was indicated above, they are treated as part of the whole. We can be sure that an issue with the *Additions* probably followed one which did not have them. Therefore "V" and "VI" have been assigned to their places, and the behavior of signature O determines their order.

The order of "II," "III" and "IV" presents more of a problem. They appear to be mixed issues, with "II" preceding "III"

SIGNATURE UNITS

Issues

	[A]	B-H	I	K	L	M	N	O	P	[Q-R]
Paging	41	1-56	57-64	65-72	73-78	[79]-84				
"I"	1	1	1	1	1	1				
Paging	[1-8]	[9]-64	57-64	73-80	81-88	[79]-84				
"II"	2	2	1	2	2	1				
Paging	[1-8]	[9]-64	57-64	73-80	73-78	[79]-84				
"III"	3	2	1	2	1	1				
Paging	[1-8]	[9]-64	57-64	73-80	73-78	89-96				
"IV"	1	2	1	2	1	2				
Paging	[1-8]	[9]-64	57-64	73-80	81-88	89-96	41	[97]-104	105-112	113-120
"V"	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	121-136
Paging		The Paging for this issue is the same as in "V"								
"VI"	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
Paging		The Paging for this issue is the same as in "V"								
"VII"	4	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	2	1

because of the title-page. Issue "IV," however, fails to fit any pattern. However, the only copy of this issue seen is one in the American Antiquarian Society and it is trimmed, apparently once having been in a bound volume of pamphlets. It is possible that it is either an imperfect copy lacking the *Additions* or that it is an incorrectly made-up copy.

The general confusion in the printing of *Plain Truth* is symbolic of the position which the pamphlet holds in the struggle for the Declaration of Independence. Those who tried to oppose the ever-growing radical forces were disorganized and silent. The moderate position had much to recommend it, but the leaders were never able to present their arguments in a unified and forceful fashion. The incoherence in both the printing and the writing of *Plain Truth* seems to be part of the same pattern.

Bibliographical Notes

The Creation of a Ghost

In my continuing search for undescribed "post-incunabula" editions of the Low Countries, to be included in another supplementary part of Nijhoff-Kronenberg, *Nederlandsche Bibliographie van 1500 tot 1540* ('s-Gravenhage, 1923-1951), my eye fell on Stillwell, *Census M* 504:

Een geestelijke Minnebrief. Die negen Couden. Die seven Banden. [Schoonhoven: Fratres apud S. Michaelen in den Hem, about 1500.] 8°.

The only copy reported there was that in the Pierpont Morgan Library. Since this is an edition dated "about 1500" and not mentioned by M. F. A. G. Campbell in his *Annales de la typographie néerlandaise au XVe siècle* (La Haye, 1874-1890), the description of this volume should certainly be incorporated in our *Nederlandsche Bibliographie*. So I began my study by requesting some photostats of the book to be made for me: the first page, the beginning of *Die negen Couden*, and the last page in the volume.¹

Even before receiving the photostats, I had been slightly puzzled by the title of the book, knowing of no other edition in which the *Geestelijke Minnebrief* and the tract of the *Negen Couden* (etc.) were printed together. On examining the three photostats, serious doubts arose in my mind. The text and setting of the first leaf proved to be identical with folio 73 recto of another edition issued by the Fratres at Den Hem, *Devote Materien dienende tot salicheit van allen kersten menschen*, August 31, 1503.² Only one slight difference was apparent. Instead of the letter *c* appearing in the normal place for a signature-mark, the Morgan copy apparently had an *a*. The *a* was, however, a letter of such uncommon shape that I immediately became suspicious of it. Something was certainly wrong with this character. Then too, the woodcut on the last page, representing a Mass of St. Greg-

¹ It is my pleasant duty to express my deep appreciation to the Pierpont Morgan Library for the gift of a set of photostats, and to Dr. Curt F. Bühler for information as to pertinent details. The present article was written at his instigation.

² Described in Nijhoff-Kronenberg, no. 1502.

ory, was the cause for further suspicion and doubts. Though quite familiar with the printers of Dem Hem and their typographical material, I had never yet come across this cut in any of the editions put out by them. Having these doubts in mind, I most seriously mistrusted the ascription. With W. M. Conway's standard work as a guide,³ I began to search for woodcuts of the St. Gregory Mass in the rich collection of early printed books of the Low Countries found in our Royal Library. This search had a happy result, for I found the identical cut in an edition printed by Hugo Jansz. van Woerden at Leyden on October 16, 1499: *Die Spieghel der volcomenheit* (Campbell 1580). There it is somewhat less damaged at the top than in the book in the Pierpont Morgan Library, but the break on the left side occurs in both. The cut was also listed by Conway (p. 304, sect. 30.3).

Intuition and imagination are some of the bibliographer's best aids, if cautiously used. They may make an excellent springboard for further investigations. What they suggest to us, however, must always be thoroughly checked. In order to verify my suspicions that this book was not a complete entity but was composed of two totally unrelated parts produced by different printers, I urgently needed more photostats, especially of the opening comprising the last leaf of the quire with the curious *a* signature-mark (mentioned above) and the beginning of gathering *b*. Photostats of some of the other woodcuts were also necessary for my purposes. Finally, Dr. Bühler, at my request, was kind enough to examine the singular signature *a* of the first quire. His opinion was that it did "look tampered with. Since it too has been 'rubricated,' there is some red ink over the mark. However I am reasonably sure that this mark never was an *a*."

The second group of photostats, together with the information about the signature *a*, fully confirmed my first impression that the Morgan volume (PML 660)⁴ was not a complete book printed by only one printer but was "made up" as follows:

- (a) One quire, properly c⁸, leaves 73-80 of *Devote Materien*, Den Hem near Schoonhoven: Frates, August 31, 1503. 8°.
- (b) Leaves 9-79, being quires b⁸-k⁷, of a hitherto undescribed and unreported edition of *Die negen Couden, Die seven Banden*, etc., s.n.l.a.? [Leyden: Hugo Jansz. van Woerden, about 1505]. 8°.

³ *The Woodcutters of the Netherlands in the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1884).

⁴ The book is listed as no. 1667 (with the approximate date [1500]) by Ada Thurston and Curt F. Bühler, *Check List of Fifteenth Century Printing in the Pierpont Morgan Library* (New York, 1939), p. 154.

The second item thus lacks the first quire and everything after k7. Comparison with similar editions makes it reasonably certain that what is lacking at the end are the last leaf of quire k and all of gatherings l⁸-n⁸. A complete copy would then have contained 104 leaves. The printer's name, his address, and the date of publication might have been included on a title-page or in a colophon. Hugo Jansz. van Woerden moved from Leyden to Amsterdam in 1506, so that if the book is slightly later than the date suggested above, it may well have been printed in the latter city.

Three of the woodcuts, photostats of which I now have at my disposal, enabled me to date the book in a general sort of way. The Adoration of the Magi (leaf c2 verso), Christ falling under his Cross (leaf d4 verso), and Christ nailed to the cross (leaf e2 recto) also appeared in *Dat leven ons liefs heren Ihesu Cristi*, Leyden: Hugo Jansz. van Woerden, [no date]⁵ and elsewhere. Campbell 1114 dated this edition "vers 1500," but a close examination has enabled me to correct the date and to place it as "circa 1503." For this reason it was inserted in our *Nederlandsche Bibliographie* (no. 3389; compare the note printed there). Now these three cuts all show a more worn state than in Campbell 1114-Nijhoff-Kronenberg 3389. Accordingly a date of "circa 1505" seems to be a proper and conservative estimate.

In conclusion, the question must be raised as to how it was possible that this ghost escaped detection by the learned compilers of the J. P. Morgan catalogue (*Catalogue of Manuscripts and Early Printed Books from the Libraries of William Morris, Richard Bennett, etc. . . . now forming Portion of the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, London, 1907).⁶ A full description of this book was given there (III, 138, no. 660), and the woodcuts were attributed to the Second Schoonhoven woodcutter; the following note was appended: "These cuts appear not to be described by Conway (pp. 305-306)." This is, in fact, quite true, for Conway, as we have seen above, assigned them to the Second Leyden woodcutter.

The catalogue further remarks that "leaves 9-80 are earlier than leaves 1-8, the type of the first quire being a good deal more worn. This piece is perhaps complete in itself." Though the actual state of affairs is here

⁵ The cuts are mentioned by Conway, *op. cit.*, p. 303, sect. 30.1, nos. 5, 27, and 28, as produced by the Second Leyden woodcutter.

⁶ Although the descriptions were made by several different bibliographers, the final responsibility for the editing of the catalogue rested with the distinguished English bibliographer Alfred W. Pollard. However, from the manner in which the catalogue was compiled, it is quite uncertain who was responsible for the slip in admitting this book as a single unit.

nearly recognized, the problem was not further pursued nor the proper conclusions reached.

The fact that the culprit who fabricated the ghost was a real artist in such falsifications probably explains his success. There is one characteristic feature of Low Country printings of this period which must have been a help to him. The presses often produced theological tracts printed with a uniform, so-called "Lettersnijder," type (M75/100). Despite a lifelong study of the type, I have been able, with the utmost difficulty, to find only a few differentiations in this fount as used by the different printers; mostly the type is completely identical. In consequence of this, fragments of distinct editions by two or more printers can easily be combined without raising suspicion. Finally, we may note, as another convenience for the fabricator, the fact that most of the tracts are of an octavo format and usually have 20 lines of text to the page.

In any event, I suppose (at least, I hope) that the fabricator would have had less success if he had offered the "reconstructed" volume to a Dutch or Belgian dealer or collector rather than on the English market. Would not the gap in the Dutch text between the existing leaf 8 verso and 9 recto have been noted by one conversant with the language? The first quire, in fact, ends with a completed sentence and an "Amen" (A $\ddot{m}$), while the second gathering starts in the middle of a sentence (was O du geb $\ddot{u}$ dijde...). These facts, together with the differences in the types (apparent even on the photostats), should have led to suspicion and further investigation by bibliographers more familiar with the Dutch language.

It seems impossible to believe that the creation of this ghost was due to carelessness or incompetence on the part of a binder. The skilful changing of the signature-letter *c* into an *a* (in order to supply a first quire), and the removal of leaf 80 (presumably with text) and the substitution of a blank leaf in its place, thus causing the volume to end at folio 79 verso with a woodcut—all these facts show thoughtful premeditation on the part of a cunning man. Perhaps he may still be alive; may he read this indictment with dismay!

As a bibliographer, I think it a source of satisfaction that my investigation has yielded practical results. I failed to discover an unknown edition of *Een geestelijke Minnebrief*, but did come upon another undescribed edition of the early sixteenth century. Although the book is incomplete, the description of this new edition of *Die negen Couden* will be gratefully inserted in the future Nijhoff-Kronenberg III, II.

M. E. KRONENBERG

The Hague, January, 1955

Another Early Edition of Thomas Jevon's "Devil of a Wife"

A few years ago attention was called to the fact that what had been listed in the Woodward and McManaway *Check List of English Plays 1641-1700* as the single edition no. 664 of Thomas Jevon's *Devil of a Wife*, 1695, was instead two distinct editions each dated 1695 and collating 4°, A-G⁴, pp. [8] 1-47 48.¹ The edition known as no. 664, it was stated, derived directly from no. 663, the 1693 edition, and from it stemmed no. 665, also in 1695, a condensed edition collating 4°, A⁴ B-F⁴, pp. [6] 1-42, with p. 34 misprinted as 43. No. 664 was to be distinguished from its newly discovered twin, no. 664a, by various readings, the simplest being line 6 of sig. C4, which in no. 664 read 'Witneffes of my Proceedings' but in no. 664a '... to my Proceedings'. In addition, line 9 of the epilogue on sig. G4 contained the enjoyable misprint '*fmelling*' in no. 664a for no. 664, '*the buskins empty fwelling*'. Since nos. 664 and 664a are line for line and page for page editions, it was clear that the direct transmission of readings ran from no. 663 to no. 665 through no. 664, and that no. 664a must derive from no. 664 but was a terminal edition.

Further examination of copies of this play now discloses that there were four, not three, editions in 1695; and that three of these editions have the same collation 4°, A-G⁴. The newly discovered edition, no. 664b, is found in the Harvard College Library and the Boston Public Library. Its title-page is readily distinguished from the titles of nos. 664 and 664a by the comma between 'OR' and 'A' in the third line of the title, as in no. 665, but not otherwise, and by the imprint reading '*Paul's*' instead of '*Pauls*' as in nos. 664 and 664a.

No. 664a still remains a terminal edition, for no. 664b is a paginal reprint of no. 664, though not quite line for line with its copy. Thus no. 664b at the end of the first line of text on sig. B1 reads 'make an' | instead of nos. 664, 664a 'make | an'. On sig. B1^v, line 2, no. 664b reads 'fmall Beer' | as against 'Small | Beer'.

The textual history is not difficult to work out. Between 664 and 664b occurs a rather marked change in the system of capitalization. Although no. 664 agrees in the major features of its capitalization with its copy no. 663, the condensed 1695 edition no. 665 agrees with no. 664b. Hence no. 664b derives directly from no. 664, and no. 664b was the printer's

¹ F. O. Waller, "Notes on Restoration Plays: (3) Three 1695 Editions of Jevon's *Devil of a Wife*," *Studies in Bibliography*, III (1950), 255.

copy for no. 665, not no. 664 as was believed before the new edition turned up. Copies of no. 664 may be found in CLUC, CSmH, CtY, IU, OCU; of no. 664a in CSmH, DFo, ICN, ICU, NcD, PU; and of no. 664b in MB and MH.

Collectors will observe that in no. 664 there are two settings of the type for the inner forme of sheet D. In the more common setting, doubtless the original, the name '*Satan*' is repeated three times in italic, whereas in the other setting the name appears in roman. The outer forme of sheet E also has two settings. In the earlier, line 2 of sig. E1 reads 'Cloths', but in the later setting the spelling is 'Cloaths'. In each case, no. 664b appears to have been set from the original typesetting of these two variant formes.

FREDSON BOWERS

University of Virginia

*The "Voyage to Cadiz" in the Second Edition of Hakluyt's "Voyages"**

Passage of time has only added to the stature of Richard Hakluyt and to the importance of his great collections of *Voyages*. These large tomes, designed to stimulate English interest in maritime commerce and in claiming and colonizing the New World, have made available to us a wealth of material on early discovery and exploration. The three-volume edition of the *Voyages*, 1598-1600, has a great appeal for Americanists. It is also a high spot in English letters, appearing as Number 14 in the Grolier Club list of *One Hundred Books Famous in English Literature*. According to William Oldys, it "redounds as much to the glory of the English nation as any book that ever was published in it."¹

Biographies of Hakluyt and studies of the *Voyages* have appeared from time to time. Apparently, however, little attention has been given to the various states of the 1598-1600 edition of the *Voyages*. One occasionally sees in book catalogues or auction lists references to different states of the title page to Volume I, or to the presence of the Cadiz leaves, original or re-

* I wish to express my appreciation to these individuals and firms for the bibliographical assistance which they have given me in this study: Lewis M. Stark, New York Public Library; Lawrence C. Wroth, John Carter Brown Library; Aaron Mendoza, Mendoza Book Company; R. A. Skelton, British Museum; F. B. Maggs, Maggs Bros. Ltd.; J. O. T. Howard, Bernard Quaritch, Ltd.; and Henry Stevens, Son and Stiles.

¹ *The British Librarian* (London, 1738).

print, but I have never been able to find any specific analysis of the subject. The present article summarizes the findings of a study recently made along these lines.

I

In the year 1596, Robert Devereux, the second Earl of Essex, and Charles Howard, the Lord High Admiral of England, were named to command a mighty naval and military expedition directed against Cadiz, the great port of King Philip of Spain for trade with the Indies. Essex was then twenty-nine, handsome, dashing, and bold. He was, without question, the chief favorite of the Virgin Queen, enjoying all the preferments and glory such a position carried with it, but at times fretting under the proprietary hand of his jealous monarch.

Considering the personalities involved, the expedition went well. The Spanish war fleet was destroyed, and Cadiz lay at the mercy of the English. Only one thing went wrong: the West Indies merchant fleet was fired by the Spanish commander, and its treasure, worth millions of crowns, was lost. Essex, however, emerged as the hero of the land fighting. On his return to England, the young Earl was received with great public acclaim. Only Queen Elizabeth was unenthusiastic. Aside from the glory of the affair and the aggrandisement of Essex, what had she to show for it except a net expense of many thousands of pounds? And, already, the Earl was, perhaps, too popular, too powerful, too ambitious.

During the next three years, the fortunes of the scintillating Earl ebbed, flowed—and ebbed. At one time in favor with the Queen, at another so much in disfavor as to cause her publicly to slap his face, the Earl attempted to consolidate his gains, but with scant success. Finally, after much court intrigue, he was appointed the Queen's Lord Deputy for Ireland. His commission was to quell the Irish uprising, but more specifically to crush its leader, the treacherous but able Earl of Tyrone. A large force was organized, and in April, 1599, the expedition arrived in Ireland. By July, after a series of inconsequential actions, the original force of 16,000 was reduced to 8,000, by August to 4,000. Forced to agree to a truce with Tyrone, Essex returned to England, arriving in London September 28, 1599.

Received by the Queen with surprise and vexation, Essex was put under house arrest before the day was ended. Two months later, a statement of his delinquencies was read in the Star-Chamber before the Council. He had failed to crush Tyrone, had by his mismanagement lost a great army,

and had returned to England against the Queen's specific orders. He was no longer the Queen's favorite, but a beaten and disgraced man.

During the next two years the Earl's fortunes went from bad to worse. After an aborted attempt to gain a following and take over the government, he was seized, thrown into the Tower of London and, on February 25, 1601, at only thirty-four he was beheaded.

II

Late in 1598, the first volume of Hakluyt's enlarged edition of his *Voyages* was presented to the public. The dedication is dated October 7, but it is unlikely that many copies were available before the end of the year. It was doubtless a well-advertised work, for its forerunner, the 1589 edition, had been well received, and by 1598, Hakluyt, the author and consultant geographer, had become well known. The volume consisted in the main of voyages to the North and North-east. The concluding part was given over to a highly laudatory account of the Cadiz expedition, with much emphasis on the part that Essex played in the affair. In addition, the "famous victorie" was mentioned on the title page, the "honorable voyage" in the epistle dedicatory and the table of contents, and the "honourable expedition" and the "renowned Erle of Essex" in the preface. Probably unintentionally, the volume was excellent advertising for the Earl.

By the time that Essex had returned from Ireland a year later, the work undoubtedly had come to the notice of the Queen who, at this period, was particularly sensitive to public attestations as to the Earl's popularity. Displeased, she caused orders to be given that the title page and the final leaves containing the "Voyage to Cadiz" should be removed from unsold copies.²

The purge was, on the whole, successful; apparently very few copies escaped the censor. The original title page was readily replaced by one dated 1599, with no reference to Cadiz. And the removal of the Cadiz leaves was hardly noticeable, since they were at the end of the book.

Meanwhile, the second volume of the work had come from the press,

² We do not know, of course, who actually ordered the suppression. Oldys said ". . . Mr. Hakluyt might probably receive Command or Direction, even from one of the Patrons to whom these Voyages are dedicated, who was of the contrary Faction, not only to suppress all Memorial of that Action in the Front of this Book, but even cancel the whole *Narrative* thereof at the *End* of it, in all the Copies . . . which remained unpublished." Volume I was dedicated to Charles Howard, the Lord High Admiral, and Volume II to Sir Robert Cecil, principal secretary to Queen Elizabeth. Both these gentlemen of the court testified against Essex in the Star-Chamber proceedings of November 1599, and could therefore qualify as being of the "contrary Faction."

with the dedication dated October 24, 1599. The two volumes contained a total of 1175 pages, a thick but not unmanageable tome when bound together. And that is the state in which practically all copies of the work are found.³ Even copies of the first volume which were sold before the second volume appeared, apparently were not bound until Volume II was available. Possibly their purchasers had not expected to wait so long for the second volume, since Hakluyt had promised it for "the Spring" of 1599.

Including the original issue, there are five distinct issues of the title page to Volume I:

- (A) 1598—Original Issue
- (B) 1599—"Yeres"
- (C) 1599—"Yeares"
- (D) 1600
- (E) 1598—Reprint

The original issue (A) outlines the contents of Volume I only, using the phrase "these 1500 yerres." It refers to the "Famous victorie at . . . Cadiz, 1596."

The title page issues (B), (C), and (D) are contemporary issues brought out after the suppression order to replace the 1598 title page, with its objectionable reference to Cadiz. The order for suppression undoubtedly came after the return of Essex to London on September 28, 1599. Quite possibly it came as late as, or even after, his delinquencies were read out publicly, on November 29, 1599. All three title page issues outline the contents of the second volume as well as the first. This would seem to indicate that when the earliest of them appeared, Volume II, with dedication dated October 24, 1599, was already available.

These three contemporary re-issues of the title page contain the same wording, although they are far from being close copies of one another. There are some differences in spelling, and considerable differences in style and size of type, as well as in format and decoration. Issue (B), by far the commonest, uses the phrase "these 1600 yerres" in the seventh line of the first paragraph. Issue (C), very rare, uses "these 1600 yeares." Issue (D) may readily be distinguished by the date, 1600.

Close examination of the (B) and (C) title pages shows enough typographical similarities to indicate that both may have come from the same press. If this be so, it seems highly likely that (B) is the earlier issue, having

³ Of the 121 copies of the work covered in the survey, nine copies had the three volumes bound separately, 109 copies had Volumes I and II bound together, and three had the three volumes bound in one.

been the one arranged for by the publishers to supply the many copies known to require a new title page. It seems not unlikely that the first re-issue was not quite large enough to supply all the demand that finally developed, and that it became necessary to make another small re-issue, the (C) issue. Under the practices then followed, this could have come out as late as March 24, 1600, and still have been dated 1599. And if, in 1600, still a few more sets were found needing a new title page, the (D) issue might be explained.

Even though by the last decade of the eighteenth century most surviving copies of the *Voyages* were supplied with first volume title pages of one sort or another, there must have been a few without any title page. For, at some time during this decade, a reprint of the 1598 title page appeared. It is readily distinguishable by its late eighteenth-century type style and paper, and by the spelling "Hackluyt." A watermark date, 1794, is visible in some copies.

As has been said earlier, the removal in 1599 of the "Voyage to Cadiz" from copies of Volume I was not too noticeable, since it was at the end of the book. Nevertheless, a few copies contained the *Voyage*. And, as the true value of the great collection became more apparent, the need for a reprint of the Cadiz leaves to fill out censored copies became evident. Eventually a reprint was made, about 1720 if we are to believe William Oldys.⁴ It was a resetting of the original *Voyage*, but in somewhat larger type.

In the original printing of the *Voyage*, page 607 consists of 53 lines of text in eight paragraphs. The *Voyage* ends on page 619 with a large woodcut. Page 608 is erroneously numbered 605. Page [620] is blank. In the reprint, page 607 consists of 52 lines of text in seven paragraphs. It ends on page 620, with no woodcut. It is by far the most prevalent of the *Voyage* reprints.

Although this re-issue of 1720 must have been fairly large, apparently it was not large enough. For, late in the eighteenth century, a second reprint of the *Voyage* appeared, produced, possibly, by the same printer who put out the (E) issue of the title page. It is printed in a smaller type than the original, and ends on page 617 (which has been erroneously numbered

⁴ The date of the 52-line reprint has been variously assigned by different authorities. However, Oldys, writing in 1737, said "But at last, about the middle of the late King's Reign, an uncastrated Copy did arise, and the said Voyage was reprinted from it; whereby many imperfect Books have been made complete." He was obviously referring to the 52-line reprint which ends on page 620, since his description of the *Voyages* assigned 620 pages to Volume I. The "late King" must have been George I, who reigned from 1714 to 1727. Hence a date of about 1720 seems indicated.

"417") with a tail-piece of late eighteenth-century style. Page 607 consists of 63 lines of text in ten paragraphs. Some copies show watermark dates of 1790 and 1794, dating the issue fairly conclusively.

One might think that by the middle of the nineteenth century, all copies of the work would have been supplied with the "Voyage to Cadiz." Yet about this time we find Henry Stevens of Vermont bringing out at his London book establishment a third reprint of the *Voyage*.⁵ This was an exact facsimile of the original (53-line) printing, done by John Harris on old paper. It is an excellent reproduction of the original, so good, in fact, that at times it may have been mistaken for the original. However, close examination of the paper and the impression shows it to be the facsimile which it really is.

To recapitulate, then, we find the "Voyage to Cadiz" in four different states:

- (A) Original printing (53-line)
- (B) 52-line reprint
- (C) 63-line reprint
- (D) 53-line facsimile reprint

Early in 1954, I set about making a survey of the extant copies of the *Voyages*, to get some idea of the prevalence of the various issues of the title page and the "Voyage to Cadiz." Unable to examine personally more than a relatively small number of copies, I conducted the survey by mail, using a questionnaire accompanied by detailed descriptions of the different issues. These were sent to the larger university and public libraries in this country and in Europe, and to a few book dealers and collectors known to specialize in this field.

The response was good. The inquiries resulted in descriptions of 121 sets of the work, in the hands of 69 owners. Since there are unquestionably other copies of the *Voyages* which I have not been able to locate, the survey does not constitute a census in the accepted sense of the word. Nevertheless, in view of the limited size of the edition—at most 1,000 copies⁶—and

⁵ Henry Stevens went to London in 1845, and undoubtedly had dealings with the elder Harris soon after, for by 1852 he referred to him as "my old friend." This places the earliest date at which the facsimile could have been made as shortly before 1850. In a catalogue of Willis and Sotheran's of 1862, a three-volume "Principal Navigations" is listed, containing the "Voyage to Cadiz" "in exact facsimile." Since no facsimile reprint other than the Stevens' is known, it must be the one alluded to in the catalogue, which would mean it was made before 1862.

⁶ At this date the maximum number of copies in an edition of a work was limited to this number by the Stationers' Company's regulations.

the passage of three-and-a-half destructive centuries since publication, this number probably represents a large majority of the extant sets.⁷

The table below shows a summary of the results of the survey. The different issues of the title page are shown at the top, and the issues of the "Voyage to Cadiz" down the side.

SURVEY TABLE

	"Voyage to Cadiz"	Title Page to Volume I							Total
		1598 (A) Integral	Disjunct	1599 (B)	1599 (C)	1600 (D)	1598 Reprint (E)	No Title- page	
Original	Integral	20	4	10			1	1	36
Printing									
(A)	Disjunct	6	10	11				1	28
52-line Reprint	(B)		5	20		2*	1*	1	28
63-line Reprint	(C)		1	2			1	1	5
Facsimile Reprint	(D)	1		5					6
No "Voyage"		5	2	8	1	1		1	18
Total		32	22	56	1	3*	3*	5	121

* Includes one copy with both (D) and (E) title pages.

As the table discloses, the (B) issue is the most prevalent title page to Volume I, although the original (A) issue is almost as common. And it can be seen that the majority of the copies covered by the survey contain the original (A) issue of the "Voyage to Cadiz," with the 52-line reprint (B) the next most common. Copies with both the original title page and the original *Voyage* (type A-A) are the most common *type*, representing about one third of the total. It should be noted, however, that in only half the (A-A) copies do the title pages and Cadiz leaves both appear to be integral parts of the volume. In the remaining (A-A) copies, the title page or the *Voyage*, or both, show evidences such as re-margining, rehinging, old stubs, or inconsistencies in the watermark sequences, of having been placed in the book at some later time. Hence, it would seem that perhaps only one copy in six has come down to us in the original form.

⁷ As early as 1737 Oldys said the work had become "scarce and obscure."

It is, of course, quite impossible at this late date to write the statistical history of this great work. Nevertheless, we might be not far wrong if we were to say that:

(1) About one copy in four escaped the censor's knife in 1599. About one-third of these subsequently had the 1598 title page removed and replaced by the new, "up-to-date" 1599 (B) title page.

(2) Quite a few of the title pages and Cadiz leaves removed on order in 1599 were saved, and, after Elizabeth's death in 1603, used to complete censored copies. In addition, some copies were supplied with the missing parts taken from other, less desirable sets. About one-sixth of the copies were completed in this way, using the 1598 title page, and an additional tenth were completed using the 1599 (B) title page.

(3) During the early part of the 18th century, one-sixth of the copies, already with 1599 (B) title pages, were made complete by inserting the 52-line reprint of the *Voyage*.

(4) One copy in six has come down to us as intended by Elizabeth's censors, with no "Voyage to Cadiz." In nearly half of these, however, the 1598 title page was spared.

(5) Most of the remaining censored copies were completed over the years, using other issues of the title page and Cadiz leaves.

The survey covered two other points of bibliographical interest, the size of the copies, and the presence (or absence) of the Wright-Molyneux map. On seven copies I was unable to get dimensions. For the remaining 114 copies, the heights of the pages were as follows:

10¼ to 10¾ inches	1 copy
10½ to 10⅝ inches	5 copies
10¾ to 10⅞ inches	10 copies
11 to 11⅛ inches	28 copies
11¼ to 11⅜ inches	38 copies
11½ to 11⅝ inches	24 copies
11¾ to 11⅞ inches	2 copies
12 to 12⅛ inches	3 copies
12¼ to 12⅜ inches	1 copy
12½ to 12⅝ inches	2 copies

The average copy of today is about 11¼ inches tall, but the original issue was undoubtedly taller than this. Cropping had been practiced extensively before the time of Dibdin, who said "copies are usually cropt. I never saw it uncut."⁸

⁸ *The Library Companion* (London, 1825).

Of the 121 sets of the *Voyages* covered in the survey, fourteen contain the Wright-Molyneux map in one of the two original states. The names of the institutions having copies of the *Voyages* with the map follow:

<i>Library</i>	<i>State of Map</i>
New York Public	Second
Newberry, Chicago	Second
Princeton University	First and Second (in 2 copies of the work)
Alderman (University of Virginia)	Second
Clements (University of Michigan)	First
Huntington, San Marino, California	First and Second (in 2 copies of the work)
Free Library of Philadelphia	Second
Bodleian, Oxford University, England	Second
Cambridge University, England	First
British Museum	First and 2 Seconds (in 3 copies of the work)

In addition to these, the map is occasionally found in copies of the 1589 *Voyages*, as well as separately.

CHARLES E. ARMSTRONG

11 *Birchwood Avenue*
West Orange, N. J.

An Unrecorded Edition of Milton's "Defensio Secunda" (1654)

It is generally known that Milton's *Defensio Secunda* appeared in two separate editions in 1654. The first issued from the press of Thomas Newcomb in London on or about May 30,¹ and the second came from Adrian Vlacq in The Hague some time between that time and October.² The Columbia editor quite properly used the former as the basis of his text

¹ See my *Life Records of John Milton* (New Brunswick, New Jersey, Rutgers University Press, 1954), III, 376 ff. I wish to thank the Rutgers University Research Council for financial aid in gathering material for this article as well as for the book.

² *Ibid.*, 407, 411-412, 421. The July reports to Thurloe that Vlacq was reprinting the book does not necessarily mean that the books were actually ready for immediate distribution. It may have been nearly October, as Masson suggests, before they became available.

because it is the best; but, though mentioning the Hague edition, he gave no collation of the two texts.³ However, few if any students of Milton seem to have recognized that Vlacq put out *two* editions, not one. Yet copies of both of these Hague editions are common; I myself own one of each. The reason for the oversight is probably that both have the same number of pages, use the same type, have one identical gathering, and print page for page.⁴ It is the purpose of the present paper to present the chief variants between the two Vlacq editions.

The variants may be divided into three groups: (1) purely typographical differences; (2) differences in spelling, punctuation, and the like, of no particular significance; and (3) more important divergences which may affect the grammar and even the meaning of the text. For convenience we may label the two Hague editions as A and B.⁵

There are a number of differences which are purely typographical. (1) The A text uses considerably fewer acute, grave, and circumflex accents than the B, though sometimes A will give an accent which B omits. There may be anywhere up to a dozen or more differences in any one page. (2) The punctuation often differs in font. Periods and colons, especially, seem to come indiscriminately from roman or gothic fonts. (3) The use of abbreviations such as semicolons and tildes seems completely a matter of the whim of the printer at the moment of printing.

³ *The Works of John Milton*, ed. F. A. Patterson (N. Y., Columbia University Press) VIII (1933), ed. Eugene J. Strittmatter. The collation at the end of the volume, which might seem to be a collation of the London and Hague editions, appears to be actually merely a list of changes which the editor has made from the original London edition.

⁴ The first eight leaves, including the title-page, the address to the reader, and the "Typographus Pro Se-Ipso," together with the last four leaves, constituting sigs. F-F4v, are the equivalent of one complete gathering of this duodecimo edition. For some curious reason they appear to be identical in the two editions, though the remainder (pp. 1-120, sigs. A-E12v) shows the differences to be given later in this article.

⁵ I use the letters A and B arbitrarily to distinguish the two Hague editions. For most of the collation given below I have used my own copies, but I have checked representative pages in a number of other copies. Copies of A may be found in the Harvard College Library, shelf-mark 14497.14.5; in the Rutgers University Library (X DA396.A3S45); in the Princeton University Library (Ex 3859.313.11); and in the Huntington Library. Copies of B may be found in the Harvard College Library (14497.13.3.2); in the New York Public Library (*KC.1652); and in the Huntington Library. I wish to thank these libraries for their courtesy in making photostatic reproductions of selected pages of their copies and for allowing me to publish the material.

Either edition may show *meque*, for example, as *meq;*, *ibidem* as *ibidē*, and so on. (4) Milton's first name appears in the running heads in a variety of spellings. Though *Ioannis* is the most common form, it appears in A ten times as *Iohannis* and five times as *Ioaanis*. B is more consistent, showing only four appearances as *Iohannis* and none as *Ioaanis*. (5) The location of the signature marks at the foot of the page, naturally enough, is seldom uniform between the two editions, but varies as much as four or five letters' width from one to the other. (6) The spacing between words and around punctuation marks is another sign of the different printings. One edition may space before a comma while the other spaces after it. Line indentations and divisions also vary. On one page, for instance (p. 31), the first line in one edition ends in the middle of a word, whereas the other gets the whole word on the line. With this beginning, the differences continue through the whole page, with anywhere up to ten or fifteen letters' difference in the stopping point. But at the end of the page (as on every other page except 34, where one additional syllable is carried over to the following page in B) the two editions come out together. On another page (22), when there is a space of a few lines at the bottom of the page before the beginning of a quotation at the top of the next, edition A uses complete lines throughout, whereas B has the last three or four lines indented in the form of an inverted pyramid. (7) Finally, use of the swash capital *A* of *Angli* in the running heads shows almost complete caprice. Though the swash letter appears to be the practice, the plain capital appears instead on 13 pages in both editions, on 14 in A alone, and on 16 in B alone.⁶

More important, perhaps, than these outposts is the second class of variants, which concern punctuation and spelling chiefly. There are so many on almost every page that we need only examine a few random samples. In general, the punctuation in A tends to be heavier than that in B. In other words, about two times out of three when one has a period to the other's comma and so forth, the period will be in A. In the remaining instance it will be in B. The following list gives (1) page and line occurrences in (a) the Hague editions and (b) the Columbia edition, (2) the reading in A, (3) the reading in B, and (4) the reading in Columbia. The same method will be followed in later tables.

⁶ Both editions have ordinary capital A's, not swash letters, on pp. 14, 34, 40, 50, 54, 56, 70, 88, 100, 110, 122, 124, and 128. A, but not B, uses the ordinary straight capital on pp. 4, 10, 12, 42, 44, 46, 58, 76, 92, 102, 104, 108, 112, and 114. B, but not A, uses it on pp. 22, 24, 28, 38, 48, 52, 60, 62, 66, 68, 74, 80, 86, 96, 116, and 118.

LOCATION	EDITION A	EDITION B	COLUMBIA
6:27; 12:8	lingua,	lingua.	linguâ,
8:20; 16:2	nemo,	nemo	nemo,
16:23; 32:6	hortis,	hortis.	hortis,
36:6; 70:3	est	est;	est
45:3; 88:2	scorta;	scorta:	scorta;
98:17; 196:9	sumpsisse.	sumpsisse:	sumpsisse.
100:28; 200:19	sollicitus.	sollicitus,	sollicitus.

There are innumerable instances of differences in spelling, where the printer carelessly substituted one letter for another which looks like it. Though the explanation may at times be simply a pied font, it may in others indicate the failure of the printer to recognize the words which he was setting. I have noticed, for example, about a dozen confusions between the letters c and e, about eighteen between r and t, and about thirty between u and n. The type being fairly small, it would be easy for the printer to mistake one for the other. In fact, I have frequently had to use a magnifying glass to be sure what some letters were. A few representative examples are the following.

LOCATION	EDITION A	EDITION B	COLUMBIA
I Confusion of c and e:			
52:18; 102:21	significatio	significatio	significatio
74:7; 146:11	<i>episcopi</i>	<i>episeopi</i>	<i>episcopi</i>
119:18; 238:12	Ecclesiam	Ecelesiam	ecclesiam
102:16; 204:9	eaveant	caveant	caveant
II Confusion of r and t:			
3:7; 4:17	arq;	atq;	atque
9:4; 16:12	sunt	sunr	sunt
80:8; 158:16	indigent	indigenr	indigent
113:7; 226:5	fuerit	fuetit	fuerit
III Confusion of n and u:			
32:14; 62:19	quod	qnod	quod
71:18; 140:16	credendnm	credendum	credendum
87:26; 174:17	haud	hand	haud
109:17; 218:12	quantum	qnantum	quantum

The third type of variant is more serious than the first two. Though sometimes mere substitutions of one letter, they give a result which might be and often is a different word or at least a different form of the same word, which might change the sense of the passage. Though the following list is by no means complete, it is fairly extensive.

LOCATION	EDITION A	EDITION B	COLUMBIA
2:13; 2:15	fastu	factu	fastu
4:14; 6:23	Dæmonas	Dæmones	Dæmonas
9:8; 16:15	cum . . . unum	num . . . uno	cum . . . unum
14:3; 26:13	sit	ut	sit
16:8; 30:17	horresceret	horrescerit	horresceret
23:15; 44:19	sodes	soles	sodes
30:25; 60:5	mimùs	minùs	minùs
32:10; 62:17	potioribus	prioribus	potioribus
32:26; 64:10	sit	fit	sit
33:25-26; 66:3	Boëmorum	Foëmorum	Boëmorum
36:22; 70:14	voluntate	volunta	voluntate
43:12; 84:8	in invidiam	invidiam	in invidiam
43:27; 84:18-19	neq, ullus	neq, ullos	neque ullus
45:4; 88:3	<i>premerem</i>	<i>premerem</i>	<i>premerem</i>
46:11; 90:10	<i>factæ</i>	<i>facta</i>	<i>factæ</i>
51:18; 100:20	nunc	tunc	nunc
55:18; 108:23	ulrimis . . . repererim	ultimis . . . repererim	ultimis . . . reppererim
56:14; 110:18	<i>quem</i>	<i>quam</i>	<i>quem</i>
57:27; 114:4-5	Vetum	Vetum	Verùm
59:14; 116:16	interpretur	interpretetur	interpretetur
62:25; 122:24	inter	iter	iter
63:3; 124:5	temetsi	tametsi	tametsi
67:9-10; 132:8-9	in-indignissimam	in-indignissimam	indignissimam
68:25; 136:1	propè	probè	propè
71:27; 142:2	<i>ratione</i>	<i>ratione</i>	<i>rationi</i>
75:29; 150:6	eo	eâ	ea
76:25-26; 152:5	<i>institueretur</i>	<i>institueretur</i>	<i>institueretur</i>
77:10; 152:16	<i>spirantes</i>	<i>sperantes</i>	<i>spirantes</i>
78:23; 156:6-7	vindicem	vindicem	vindicem
78:23; 156:7	<i>leannes</i>	<i>Ioannes</i>	<i>Joannes</i>
79:3; 156:13	mucere	munere	munere
83:28; 166:15	affimamus	affirmamus	affirmamus
84:14; 168:7	ætates	ætatis	ætates
84:18; 168:9	ministerculus	ministerculus	ministerculus
85:24-25; 170:14	<i>ingeminantem</i>	<i>ingeminantem</i>	<i>ingeminantem</i>
86:10; 172:4-5	<i>meminisse</i>	<i>miminisse</i>	<i>meminisse</i>
86:30; 172:19	negaverim	negaverint	negaverim
89:6; 178:4	otii	otiiis	otii
89:26; 178:18	animo	animi	animo
90:21; 180:14	erat	etat	erat

91:27; 182:20	<i>stems</i>	<i>flens</i>	<i>flens</i>
101:28; 202:18	ue	ne	ut
102:11-12; 204:5	minitari	minitare	minitari
102:12-13; 204:6	narrarunt	natrarunt	narrarunt
102:17; 204:9	licebit	licebet	licebit
103:7; 206:1	consilia	comsilio	consilia
109:27; 218:20	brevitate	breviate	brevitate
111:6; 222:6-7	æquales	æqualis	æquales
	inæqualis	inæqualis	inæqualis
112:30; 226:1	exteratum	exteratum	exterarum
113:14; 226:10	occubat	occupat	occupat
115:26; 230:15	petere	petiere	petere
118:1; 234:18	sustuleris	sustuletis	sustuleris
120:18; 240:10	verstra	vestra	vestra

Several conclusions can be drawn from this collation. One of the most obvious is that, whether from carelessness, ignorance, or malice, Vlacq's printer did a miserable job of reproducing Milton's book. Another is that, though both editions contain many mistakes, the B text is much worse than the A. If we add together all the categories—mere typographical alterations, changes in spelling and punctuation, and more extensive and serious variants—the B text is wrong more than twice as often as A. One might be inclined to conclude that A was printed from the London edition, and B from A. But if we draw this conclusion, we find it hard to account for such variants as *interpretur-interpretetur*, *inter-iter*, *stens-flens*, *Ieannes-Ioannes*, and *verstra-vestra*. On the other hand, the page-for-page setting makes it seem impossible that the two should have been prepared independently from the London edition, which is paged entirely differently. But we can at least be quite sure now that Vlacq issued two editions of the work from The Hague.

This new edition is one more piece of evidence of a fact which we have long known, namely that Milton's *Defensio Secunda* was popular. One of John Thurloe's foreign correspondents at The Hague wrote to him on July 24, 1654, that Milton's antagonist Alexander More had bought a whole shipment of 500 copies of the London edition sent from London to the printer Elzevier for sale, thinking thus to suppress the book, but that Vlacq had printed so many more that his scheme was futile.⁷ John Dury wrote to Samuel Hartlib on November 18, 1654, from Zurich that Vlacq had sent copies of the book to that city, "but in many places

⁷ French, *Life Records*, III, 411-412.

vnbravely printed w^{ch} wrongs the sense; and y^t none of the London print were brought to the Mart of Francfort," perhaps because of More's partially successful attempt to corner the market.⁸ Though never achieving anything like the sensational appeal of the first *Defensio*, the second of the three ventures into the wide continental arena evidently penetrated farther than has previously been realized.

J. MILTON FRENCH

Rutgers University

W. T. Sherwin: A Little-Known Paine Biographer

Of three pioneer biographers of Thomas Paine, two, Richard Carlile and Thomas Clio Rickman, are familiar figures to scholars. Carlile has been the subject of at least two biographies and several shorter essays;¹ Rickman, who was one of Paine's personal friends, has figured in various studies devoted to Paine.² The third member of the group, W. T. Sherwin, has remained relatively unknown. Although he engaged in extensive publishing activities, bibliographers have given him almost no attention. None of the standard biographical dictionaries or general reference works contains anything more than a brief notice of his *Memoir of the Life of Thomas Paine* and of *Sherwin's Weekly Political Register*, which he edited. Indeed, no bibliographical references reveal his Christian names, which are William Thomas. It is strange that nothing more is known about Sherwin, for his is one of the most significant of the early biographies of Thomas Paine.

The earlier lives of Paine by Francis Oldys (George Chalmers), William Cobbett, and James Cheetham were skillful detractions designed to turn Paine's disciples into foes. At least ten years elapsed before the pamphleteer of the American Revolution was given sympathetic treatment in the biographies of Rickman, Sherwin, and Carlile. The exact chronology

⁸ *Ibid.*, III, 443.

¹ Guy A. Aldred, *Richard Carlile, Agitator* (Glasgow, 1941); Theophila Carlile Campbell, *The Battle of the Books* (London, 1899). See also material about Carlile in William H. Wickwar, *The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press, 1819-1832* (London, 1928).

² Moncure D. Conway, *The Life of Thomas Paine . . .*, 2 Vols. (New York, 1892); Philip S. Foner, *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, 2 Vols. (New York, 1945). See also article on Rickman's life in *Dictionary of National Biography*, XLVIII, p. 266, by Charlotte Fell Smith.

and dates of these works, which appeared in rapid succession, may now be stated: Rickman's, May, 1819; Sherwin's, August, 1819; and Carlile's, November, 1820.³

All these authors were in some way concerned with one or more of the "republican" weeklies which existed in great numbers during the period 1813-1830. Rickman wrote many articles, poems, and memorials eulogizing Paine which were published in the *Republican* (1813), *Sherwin's Weekly Political Register* (1817-1819), the *Black Dwarf* (1817-1826), and in the later *Republican* (1819-1826) which supplanted the *Register*. Sherwin, founder and editor of the *Register*, had learned his trade on the staff of the early *Republican*. Richard Carlile, close friend and associate of Sherwin, began his career on the staff of the *Register*; and when Sherwin relinquished his position as editor in 1819, Carlile assumed the post and immediately changed the title of the weekly to the *Republican*, despite the fact that this name had been used twice before with unfortunate results. Carlile was perhaps the most outspoken defender of Thomas Paine during the early years of the nineteenth century. He helped to initiate the Paine Birthday Celebrations in 1818, wrote innumerable articles in praise of the American patriot, printed and published most of Paine's political and theological writings, and suffered nearly ten years of imprisonment because of his espousal of Paine's controversial theories.

Rickman's treatment of Paine is a readable, chatty account which contains the necessary biographical data together with some comment by the author based on his personal acquaintanceship with Paine. The book is an obviously pro-Paine document which was no doubt written to counteract the derogatory works of Oldys, Cobbett, and Cheetham. Carlile's account was a short treatment in pamphlet form published as an adjunct to the writings of Paine which Carlile had been issuing for several years. Notwithstanding its grandiloquent statement of purpose—"a fair and candid account in which the reader may find the real truth"—it may hardly be compared with Rickman's more accurate, full-length volume. Sherwin's *Memoirs of Paine* is perhaps the best of the three. Although at times patronizing to the point of fatuousness, it has a flowing style and is reasonably well documented.

Sherwin's father had been the keeper of Southwell Bridewell in Northamptonshire. After his death in 1813, young Sherwin, only fourteen but having had some experience as a clerk in an attorney's office, was appoint-

³ *Black Dwarf*, III (May 5, 1819), 279-280; *Republican*, I (August 27, 1819), 16; Guy A. Aldred, ed., *Jail Journal* by Richard Carlile (Glasgow, 1942), p. 6.

ed keeper and remained there until the end of 1816. During this time he had begun to read the works of Paine, and had been so taken with them that he wrote a political pamphlet of his own which he sent to some of the crusading publishers in London. Apparently, however, the pamphlet was fiery enough to deter even these publishers from accepting it, and Sherwin decided that he would come to London, purchase a printing press, and publish the paper himself. Early in 1817 he secured part of the premises at 183 Fleet Street and in April began publication of his first periodical, the *Republican*, which changed its name after six weeks to *Sherwin's Weekly Political Register*.

On March 21, 1818, Sherwin announced in his *Register* that he was going to write and publish a life of Thomas Paine, and that the work would be ready for distribution in May or June of that same year. In the same announcement he requested any person "who may have been acquainted with Paine, or who may know anything of his conduct or character," to send such information to him for inclusion in the projected biography. Response to his request must have been negligible, for on August 8, 1818, Sherwin reported in the *Register* that "The Life of Paine . . . is postponed for the present."

On April 14, 1819, the following short notice was printed in the *Black Dwarf*, a rival "republican" weekly owned and edited by Thomas Jonathan Wooler:

Mr. Clio Rickman is about to publish a LIFE OF MR. PAINE: it has been long delayed from a variety of causes; but Mr. R. from personal acquaintance with Mr. Paine, has had the best opportunity of compiling the materials.⁴

This paragraph touched off a bitter argument between Wooler and Rickman on the one side and Sherwin on the other. Three days later Sherwin wrote a lengthy article for the *Register* in which he said:

The readers of the *Register* will recollect that I some time ago announced my intention of publishing a life of THOMAS PAINE. This was undertaken at the earnest request of many persons who thought that the publisher of his works was bound in duty to furnish a life of the author. I immediately began to collect materials, and though in doing this I experienced considerable difficulty, I was happy to find that my success was much greater than I at first expected. Having procured the history of Mr. Paine up to his last embarkation for America, there only remained the latter part of his life to make the account complete. In order to obtain this, I wrote to a political friend of mine in the

⁴ *Black Dwarf*, III (April 14, 1819), 238.

United States, to request that he would procure me the materials for the purpose. In a few months afterwards I was informed by the father of this gentleman that a parcel had arrived for me by the *Radius*, inclosed in another parcel, directed to Mr. Wooler. The way in which he had ascertained this, was by another letter which had arrived by another vessel, and which letter also informed him that Mr. Wooler's said packet likewise contained a packet of letters for him, the father of my said friend. These last mentioned letters arrived safe; but what appeared most singular, when I inquired of Mr. Wooler whether he had received anything from America for me, I was informed that he had not!!⁵

In the remainder of the article Sherwin implied that the manuscripts which were intended for him were turned over to Rickman, and that Rickman had used these papers as a basis for his biography of Paine.

Wooler did not allow Sherwin's indictment to go unanswered. In the issue of the *Black Dwarf* for April 21 he charged him with the publication of "the most unfounded calumny, and the most barefaced falsehood, that it was possible for cowardice and malignity to devise." He further invited Sherwin to meet him, in company with two disinterested parties, to settle the argument. Sherwin replied in the *Register* for April 24, agreeing to the meeting "although he saw no necessity for this plan, or the benefit that can arise from it if adopted."

Back and forth flew the insults and recriminations, until the matter was seemingly brought to a head by Wooler in the *Black Dwarf* of May fifth. After again charging Sherwin with deliberate slander, malicious falsehood, and gross impudence, he concluded by citing a series of letters which had passed between Rickman and Sherwin in which Rickman positively denied all knowledge of the manuscripts which Sherwin had accused him of receiving. Rickman also noted that he had finished his Paine biography "a little time after [Paine's] death . . . and have not added any matter to it since."

Sherwin never answered in print the last charges of Wooler and Rickman, and in early summer the *Register* suspended publication. Carlile notes that at that time Sherwin was to be married and that Sherwin turned over the *Register* to him "to continue it, or to take it up again under whatever title [Carlile] should think best."⁶ Whatever the reason for Sherwin's retirement, the controversy ended as suddenly as it had begun, and it was not until seven months later that the final word was said on the subject. On February 16, 1820, Wooler published the following letter from Wil-

⁵ *Sherwin's Weekly Political Register*, IV (April 17, 1819), 374-376.

⁶ Theophila Carlile Campbell, *The Battle of the Books* (London, 1899), p. 14.

liam Clark, Sherwin's "political friend in the United States" who had sent the manuscripts about which the literary battle had been fought:

February 3, 1820

Dear Sir,

The manuscripts of Mr. Paine; enclosed in a parcel of papers and communications for yourself, have been the cause of much unpleasant discussion between you and Mr. Sherwin, in consequence of my neglect in not specifying for whom they were intended. That you are exonerated from any blame in detaining them, I am convinced. Mr. Sherwin believed, on the authority of my letter to him, that you had the manuscripts in your possession; and from thence arose his complaint against you, for not forwarding them; and you were, on the other hand, justified in their detention; as I had, through inadvertence, not directed them to him. When, on their delivery to him the other morning, I explained the cause of your conduct and shewed him the letter in which I thought I had inserted his name, but which was omitted, he seemed satisfied you were not in the least blameable. Trusting that this will be sufficient to clear you from any imputation, and that Mr. Sherwin and you will forget your past dissensions,

I remain, dear Sir,

Your's in friendship,

Wm. Clark⁷

Although Sherwin's biography of Paine is not a scholarly work by today's standards, it is a competent piece of writing for an inexperienced lad of nineteen. It is, in company with Rickman's volume, a landmark in Paine scholarship: the initial attempt to portray the life of the controversial American pamphleteer in its true light. But Sherwin's work did not sell—at least not well enough to keep him out of the hands of his creditors; for bankruptcy proceedings were announced against "William Thomas Sherwin, Bookseller, Dealer, and Chapman," in the *London Gazette*, March 5, 1822. One year and one month later, on April 5, 1823, the action was completed. Sherwin's creditors were called to a meeting "on the 26th day of April, inst., to make Dividends of the Estate and Effects," after which date the name of Sherwin drops from sight. Carlile notes that after Sherwin's marriage, the couple left London so that Sherwin, having attained his majority, could claim his inheritance, probably in Northamptonshire. At all events, no further notices concerning him appear in any of the contemporary newspapers or periodicals, and so it may be assumed that he had had enough of printer's ink in these uneasy times and that he had retired to the country with his bride.

University of Maryland

HARRISON T. MESEROLE

⁷ *Black Dwarf*, IV (February 16, 1820), 216.

*"The Red Badge of Courage": A Collation of Two Pages of
Manuscript Expunged From Chapter XII*

My *Stephen Crane: An Omnibus* (N. Y., Knopf, 1952; London, Heinemann, 1954) reproduced for the first time portions of an early draft of *The Red Badge of Courage*, and presented first American publication of the final handwritten manuscript.¹ These manuscripts are preserved in a bound book; the front cover is stamped in gold lettering: *The Red Badge of Courage* | *Stephen Crane*. The final handwritten manuscript consists of 176 pages, folio, and the earlier draft appears on the verso of 58 leaves of this manuscript. The pages of this earlier draft, a short version, are not numbered consecutively, and in the bound book they appear upside down. In my account of these manuscripts in the *Crane Omnibus*,² the short version is designated as Manuscript SV and the long version as Manuscript LV. Crane expunged from Manuscript LV in an entire chapter, Chapter XII, and then renumbered Chapter XIII as XII. A portion of the original Chapter XII is extant in Manuscript SV.³

The loose sheets of these manuscripts were bound into book form by Crane's intimate friend, Willis Brooks Hawkins, to whom he shipped them as a gift in January of 1896. Writing him on January 27 from Hartwood, New York, Crane added a postscript: "I am expressing you the original ms of The Red Badge. Thought maybe you'd like it."⁴ In writing the final draft, Crane used the clean reverse sides of 58 leaves of the earlier draft. Three of these leaves contain the extant portion of the chapter which Crane later expunged from the final version. In Crane's pagination they are numbered pages 84, 85, 86. (SV page 84 appears on Verso of LV page 113; SV 85 on verso of LV 108; SV 86 on verso of LV 112.)

¹ The Folio Society edition of *The Red Badge of Courage*, edited by John T. Winterich and published in London in 1951, reproduced the new passages from the final manuscript but no portion of the earlier draft.

² Pages 201-224: "The Original Manuscripts of *The Red Badge of Courage*."

³ The extant portion of Chapter XII is reproduced in the *Crane Omnibus*, pp. 298-300.

⁴ In the *Crane Omnibus*, pp. 644-645. Since publication of this first collection of Crane letters (120 in all), 13 new ones have been published under the title *Stephen Crane's Love Letters to Nellie Crouse*, edited by Edwin H. Cady and Lester G. Wells (Syracuse, N. Y., Syracuse University Press, 1954). I am preparing for publication the set of 27 Crane-Hitchcock letters in the Berg Collection at the New York Public Library, and I have also in preparation some thirty Pinker letters, eleven Cora Crane letters, and over a dozen new Crane letters.

Before sending the loose sheets to Hawkins, Crane removed fifteen pages of Manuscript LV. One of these pages, numbered by Crane's pagination as page 98, has recently come to light and is now in the Berg Collection at the New York Public Library. Another LV page, page 102, is in the Houghton Library at Harvard. The bound manuscripts of *The Red Badge* are owned by Mr. Clifton Waller Barrett. A photocopy of these manuscripts is in the Manuscript Division of the New York Public Library, and another photocopy is in my possession—the gift of Mr. Barrett.

The expunged Chapter XII begins on page 98. It so happens that *two* versions of this page 98 exist! The Houghton Library owns the other version, a page of the LV Manuscript numbered as page 98. These two versions, which I shall designate as the Houghton 98 and the Berg 98 for the purposes of my collation, represent a first and second attempt at *revision* of the original Chapter XII which begins in Manuscript SV on page 84. The Houghton 98 consists of $\frac{1}{2}$ page folio—the opening paragraph of the expunged Chapter XII. The first paragraph of the Berg 98 corresponds, though with some alterations and additions in phrasing, to the Houghton 98 paragraph. In its second and third paragraphs the Berg 98 corresponds, though with frequent alterations in phrasing, to what Crane had previously written on page 84 of Manuscript SV.

What is singularly interesting, however, is the unused bottom half of the Houghton $\frac{1}{2}$ page folio. This was later used by Crane to keep score for a card game with Cora Haworth and a friend by the name of Camille. Cora Haworth needs no introduction. Stephen first met her in November of 1896 in Jacksonville, Florida, while waiting to get to Cuba to do some articles for the Bacheller-Johnson syndicate.⁵ The card game must have taken place at this time, in November or December of 1896, and, perhaps at the Hotel de Dreme—the “house of joy” over which Cora presided. Camille, the third hand in the game, is possibly Camillus S. l’Engle, who was a member of one of the most prominent families in Jacksonville. If this identification is correct, Camillus (he lived in Atlanta, Georgia) was paying a call at Cora’s place while visiting his relatives in Jacksonville.⁶

⁵ See Irving Bacheller, *Coming Up the Road* (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1928), page 292: “We gave him seven hundred dollars in Spanish gold to be carried in a chamois-skin belt on his person. He was to send us articles from the island as often as possible and if war came he was to write of that. He was detained in Jacksonville more than a month.”

⁶ For this conjectured identification of “Camille” I am indebted to Mrs. Lillian Gilkes, who has in preparation a biography of Cora.

The scores for their games are recorded by Crane horizontally across the page (at right angles to the script of the novel), and at the left margin there is written (perhaps in Cora's handwriting) "Red Badge of Courage." It seems reasonable to assume that of the two pages of *The Red Badge* manuscript which Cora has been reported to have once owned this Houghton 98 was one of them.⁷ On the lower half of this manuscript where Crane kept the score⁸ there is a half ring—evidently the markings of a beer mug.

Here is a collation of the three texts: (1) Manuscript SV page 84; (2) Houghton page 94; (3) Berg page 94. In *Part A* only the first sentence of Manuscript SV is given, as only this much of the first paragraph corresponds with the Houghton and Berg texts. *Part B* opens with the second sentence of Manuscript SV. This passage corresponds with the second paragraph of Berg 98. As Houghton 98 contains no more than a single paragraph it is not represented in *Part B*. *Part C* consists of the subsequent portion of Manuscript SV and likewise the subsequent portion of Berg 98, between which there is correspondence until the final words of Berg 98: "wisdom. It was"—what follows is found only in Manuscript SV.⁹

⁷ See John Berryman, *Stephen Crane* (N. Y., William Sloane, 1950), p. 94: "None of the innumerable persons who claim to have once had in their possession a manuscript of *Maggie* or of *The Red Badge* has ever produced one. Two pages of the first draft of the war novel are said to be among Cora Crane's papers." I believe, rather, that they are the two pages from the final handwritten manuscript located at the Houghton Library—at least the Houghton page 98 seems likely to be one of the two pages owned by Cora. The Houghton manuscripts came to me while the *Crane Omnibus* was in page proof, and the conjectured point is footnoted on pages 203-204.

⁸ The scores read as follows:

Cr	Cora	Camille
4	3	1
1	1	2
2	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
1	6	5
1	4	1
<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	2
11	13	2
1		<u>2</u>
1		12
<u>1</u>		
14		

Two additional sets of scores and some other figurings appear here on the bottom half of this Houghton page 98.

⁹ Reproduction of the Houghton manuscript is by permission of the Harvard

PART A

Manuscript SV 84

It was always clear to Fleming that he was entirely different from other men, that he [had *inserted above the line*] been cast in a unique mold.

Houghton 98

It was always clear to Fleming that he was entirely different from other men, that he had been cast in a unique mold. Hence, laws that might be just to the ordinary man, were, when applied to him, peculiar and galling outrages. Minds, he said, were not [all *canceled*] made [all *inserted above the line*] with one stamp and colored green. [there was an variety. *Canceled*] He was of no pattern. It was not just to measure his acts by a universal standard. The laws of the world [are *canceled*] [were *written above the line*] wrong. There was no justice under the sky when justice was meant. Men were too puny and prattling to know anything of it. If there was a [univers *canceled*] justice it must be in [the *inserted above the line*] hands of a god [G *written above to capitalize* god].

Berg 98

It was always clear to [Fleming *canceled*] [the youth *written above the line*] that he was entirely different from other men; that his mind had been cast in a unique mold. Hence laws that might be just to the ordinary [specta *canceled*] [man *written above the line*], were, when applied to him, peculiar and galling outrages. Minds, he said, were not made all one stamp and colored green. He was of no general pattern. It was not right to measure his acts by a world-wide standard. The laws of the [wron- *canceled*] [world *written above the line*] were wrong because through the vain spectacles of their makers, he appeared, [, with all men, *inserted above the line*] as of [the *canceled*] [a *written above the line*] common size and of a green color. There was no justice on the earth when justice was meant. Men were too puny and prattling to know anything of it. If there was a justice, it must be in the hands of a God.

PART B

Manuscript SV 84

Also, he regarded his sufferings as peculiar and unprecedented. No man had ever [y *crossed out*] achieved such misery. There was a melancholy grandeur in the isolation of his experiences. He saw that he was a speck raising his [tiny *canceled*] [minute *written above the line*] arms against all possible forces and

College Library. I wish to thank also Mr. William A. Jackson of the Houghton Library. Reproduction of the Berg manuscript is by permission of the Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection of the New York Public Library. I wish to thank also Dr. John D. Gordan. The original Crane material quoted in this essay is here published with the kind permission of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

fates which were swelling down upon him like storms. He could derive some consolation from viewing [his *canceled*] [the *written above the line*] sublimity of the odds.

Berg 98

He regarded his sufferings as [peculiar and *canceled*] unprecedented. No man had ever achieved such misery. There was a melancholy grandeur in the isolation of his experiences. He saw that he was a speck raising his minute arms against all possible forces and fates which were swelling down upon him in black tempests. He could derive some consolation from viewing the [sub *canceled*] sublimity of the odds.

PART C

Manuscript SV 84

But, as [he *inserted above the line*] went on, he began to feel that, after all, [his rebellion, nature perhaps had not concentrated herself against him, or, at least that *canceled passage*] nature would not blame him for his rebellion. He [still *inserted above the line*] distinctly felt that he was arrayed against the universe but he began to believe that there was no malice agitating [his *canceled*] [the vast breasts of his *written above the line*] space-filling foes. [He *w canceled*] It was merely law.

Nature had provided her creations with various defenses and ways to escape that they might fight or flee, and she had limited dangers in powers of attack and pursuit, that the things might resist or hide with a security proportionate to their strength and wisdom. It was all the same old philosophy. He could not omit a small grunt of satisfaction as he saw with what brilliancy he had reasoned it all out.

He now, [said *inserted above the line*] that, if, as he supposed his life was

Berg 98

As he went on, he began to feel that nature, for her part, would not blame him for his rebellion. He still distinctly felt that he was arrayed against the universe but he [began to believe *canceled*] [believed now *written above the line*] that there was no malice in the vast breasts of his space-filling foes. It was merely law, not merciful to the individual; but just, to a system. Nature had provided the creations with various defenses and ways of escape that they might fight or flee, and she had limited dangers in powers of attack and pursuit that the things might resist or [flee *canceled*] hide with a [strength *canceled*] [security *written above the line*] proportionate to their strength and [wids *canceled*] wisdom. It was

R. W. STALLMAN

University of Connecticut

Book Reviews

The American Bibliography of Charles Evans [dash] *A Chronological Dictionary of All Books Pamphlets and Periodical Publications* [dash] *Printed in the United States of America from the Genesis of Printing in 1639 Down to and Including the Year 1800 with Bibliographical and Biographical Notes. Volume 13* 1799-1800 by Clifford K. Shipton.* Worcester, Massachusetts, American Antiquarian Society, 1955. xiii, 349 pp. 11¼ x 8½ inches. \$25.00.

Charles Evans died on February 8, 1935, after publishing twelve volumes of his monumental *American Bibliography*, listing United States imprints from 1639 to 1799 (A-M). In the obituary which Clarence S. Brigham contributed to the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* for 1935 (n.s. v. 45, pp. 14-21), he announced that plans were then under way to continue Evans through the year 1800. "The American Antiquarian Society," Mr. Brigham wrote, "has inherited his literary material and his records, which included the copying of about one third of the titles for the period through 1800. Financial assistance for the publication must be sought, but the Society realizes that it is an obligation, as well as a privilege, to complete this important and needed compilation."

Twenty years later this "obligation" has been discharged. The American Antiquarian Society has now published the thirteenth volume of Evans, uniform with the other twelve volumes of this indispensable work on the output of the American press. Volume Thirteen contains the second half of 1799 (N-Z) and all of 1800, and continues the serial numbering of the entries from 35855 to 39162, a total of 3,308 titles.

This volume, like its predecessors, has been largely the work of one man, Dr. Clifford K. Shipton, Librarian of the American Antiquarian Society. Dr. Shipton has examined personally most of the titles he has recorded. As users of Evans are well aware, many of his entries were based on newspaper advertisements. The inclusion of similar entries in his notes for 1800 resulted in many "ghosts," and Dr. Shipton spent two years eliminating these from the record. "It has all too frequently been assumed," he writes in his Preface, "that when a printer advertised a book as 'just off the press'

it bore his imprint and the date of that year, but comparison of the correspondence and the advertisements of a printer like Isaiah Thomas shows the rashness of such conclusions." For this reason Dr. Shipton has wisely omitted titles known only from entries in dealers' catalogues, unless the title page was reproduced there photographically. Similarly he has excluded the many undated items which are so often grouped under the year 1800 (with or without a question mark) in catalogues and bibliographies, unless they can be dated "with reasonable assurance by advertisements or other evidence." Following Evans' example, invitations, tickets and circulars and forms containing blank spaces to be filled in by hand have been omitted.

The number of locations of copies cited by Evans in the previous volumes frequently depended on the available space after the collation statement. There are many instances where no copies are located because he felt that he could not afford an extra line for the library symbols. This practice, as Dr. Shipton points out, has resulted in "an exaggeration of the rarity of the books, and a great hindrance to scholars." In the present volume the editor has been generous with locations of copies and has included "all locations which might be useful to students or booksellers." In some cases, for comparatively common books, the library symbols occupy nearly a full line of type. One can feel sure that the really scarce items are correctly indicated when only one or two locations are given.

Mr. Evans' custom of entering anonymous works under the author or an institutional heading, without cross-reference from the title, has also caused many incorrect "Not in Evans" claims. In this volume Dr. Shipton has provided cross-references from the titles and placed in brackets the names of authors of anonymous books. Title entries for pseudonymous works have generally been used, unless the pseudonym might be mistaken for a real name.

Because of the increase of printing costs it was not possible in this new volume to give full titles, as Evans usually did, but in most instances the full wording of the imprints is given. Any omissions from either title or imprint are carefully indicated by suspension points. A desirable feature, also, is the bracketing of entries for books which the editor had not seen or which he had not found described in detail in a reliable bibliography.

The volume has two indexes, one of authors and another of subjects. Evans' familiar listing of printers and publishers has not been continued, an omission which is not commented on in the editor's preface, and which the present writer feels is cause for regret. To this reviewer it also seems a

somewhat unhappy arrangement to enter auction catalogues and the like under the name of the city where the auction house was located rather than directly under the firm name. For some reason this arrangement has led to inconsistencies in the index where some of the entries are unfortunately indexed only under the name of the city. This is true of five firms listed under Philadelphia. Of four New York firms only one is indexed also under its own name. Two Salem firms do appear in both places, and of eleven Boston firms all but one are indexed under the firm name as well as under Boston. One of these, David West, is incorrectly given as "Daniel" in the index.

An occasional typographical error occurs, such as "Barker" for "Barber" in the title and imprint of Nos. 36136-7 and the imprint of 36201; "J. C." instead of "T. C." Cushing in the imprint of 36966; and "Rigaud'd" for "Rigaud's" in the title of 39091, but the volume appears to be remarkably free of these minor blemishes, considering the size and detail of the undertaking. Number 36136, already referred to, is *Poor Richard Revived . . . for . . . 1799*, which Dr. Shipton notes as "omitted by Evans from the preceding volume because he had found no copy." However, this almanac is listed by Evans as number 34462 under the well-hidden entry: "Richard, Old Father, pseudonym"!

The truism that a bibliography is out of date as soon as published will, no doubt, hold to some extent in this case. It is probably inevitable that other items in this period will come to light as they have done, in large numbers, for the years covered by the previous volumes. At the present time plans are being prepared for the compilation of a supplement, to include the additions to the earlier volumes of Evans, as well as a master index to the entire work. This will be in addition to the Readex Microprint edition of all extant American imprints from 1639 to 1800 at present listed in Evans, which Dr. Shipton is also editing and which the American Antiquarian Society will publish.

In the meantime, until our indebtedness to Dr. Shipton's scholarship and industry is further increased, all students of the American scene and all curators of American imprints owe him the sincerest congratulations and thanks for bringing to a successful conclusion the record of American printing through 1800.

LEWIS M. STARK

The New York Public Library

DICKSON, SARAH AUGUSTA. *Panacea or Precious Bane; Tobacco in Sixteenth Century Literature*. [Cut] New York, The New York Public Library, 1954. xiv, 227 pages. Plates. 10 x 7 inches. \$6.00.

Miss Dickson's purpose in *Panacea or Precious Bane* is implicit in the title of the book, but it is helpful to have it clearly stated on an early page that the work is fundamentally a study in the conflict of opinion concerning tobacco which has existed since Europeans first became aware of its qualities. That contrast was perhaps most eloquently expressed by Richard Burton in 1621 in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, when he wrote "Tobacco, divine, rare, superexcellent Tobacco, which goes farre beyond all their Panaceas . . . a vertuous herbe if it be . . . medicinally used, but as it is commonly abused by most men, which take it as Tinkars doe ale, t'is a plague . . . hellish, divelish and damned Tobacco, the ruine & overthrow of Body and Soule." Upon the thread of this contrast in views Miss Dickson has strung many curious pearls of learning. Her book is close packed, and its integrated facts are presented in admirable organization. When *Tobacco. Its History* . . . was issued as a bibliographical catalogue of the Arents Library in 1937-1952, most of us realized for the first time the extent and importance of the literature relating to the "holy herb." That realization is even more strongly felt in reading Miss Dickson's book. Because of the inevitable enlargement of knowledge that has come with the growth of the collection and with its intensive study, Miss Dickson has been able to correct statements in the catalogue and to add important titles to its list of sources. Her discovery and analysis of Juan de Cárdenas, *Primera parte de los . . . secretos . . . de las Indias*, a medical work printed in Mexico City in 1591, adds to the list the first American book dealing extensively with tobacco, a book hitherto unnoticed in that connection, and a peculiarly valuable addition to the literature of the subject.

Miss Dickson has argued ingeniously the question of the earliest introduction of tobacco to Europeans through the medium of a printed book. She awards that honor to a passage in the *Lettera di Amerigo Vespucci* of Florence, 1505, in which is recorded by Vespucci a practice among certain Indians which may have been tobacco chewing. Whether the somewhat similar practice more briefly described in the *Libretto de tutta la navigazione de re de Spagna*, of Venice, 1504, the pirated first decade of Peter Martyr, was tobacco chewing is not clear, nor, indeed, is it completely proven that in either case the herb employed was actually tobacco.

Somewhat less uncertain ground is reached in Miss Dickson's narrative after this question of the first printed report of tobacco has been disposed of. In the *Opera* of 1511 (F vi^{a-b}) Peter Martyr gives an account of a procedure which has been widely, though not universally, accepted as the snuffing of powdered tobacco. Oviedo in 1535 describes the Indian practice of inhaling the smoke of a burning herb into the nostrils through a bifurcated tube, an instrument to which the users gave the name "tabaco." It was thus as the name of the implement of its use rather than of the herb itself that the word came into literature.

Thereafter Miss Dickson traces the history of tobacco sedulously from book to book in the chief literatures of Europe for more than a century. This is a fascinating performance in which she never loses sight of her purpose in assaying the idea of tobacco as panacea or bane. The early accounts in which the toxic and stupefying effects of tobacco using were emphasized by the reporters naturally made the use of it suspect to the missionaries on the spot and to many serious-minded men everywhere. The bad name thus attached to the herb has clung through the centuries. All the great names in the history of tobacco using for pleasure or as a curative are brought into the narrative in their time and place—Luis de Goes, who, probably before 1548, brought the seeds to Portugal and thus introduced tobacco culture to Europe; Hawkins, who probably brought it to England about 1565; Raleigh, whose name is improperly associated with its introduction into England; Nicot, who introduced it into France about 1560 and gave his name to the botanical genus; Liébault, L'Obel, Monardes, L'Écluse, Frampton, and all the host who have had in some way a hand in the development of tobacco culture and use. Throughout the discussion Miss Dickson treats the books she mentions with such a degree of bibliographical awareness in the distinguishing of texts and editions of texts that many in the future will go to her book impelled by other motives than an interest in tobacco.

If there are major errors in Miss Dickson's narrative they are beyond my ability to detect even though I have checked back upon many statements which came within my own field of knowledge. Without differences of opinion, however, this would be a dull world. Quite properly one may raise the question as to whether the first published account of Drake's circumnavigation of 1577-1580 is the narrative found in De Bry's *Americae Pars VIII*, of Frankfort, 1599. This narrative enters only negatively into the story of tobacco, but the question of its priority has implications of broad interest. Hakluyt had intended the publication of an account of

Drake's exploit, comprising six folio leaves, in his *Principall Navigations* of 1589, but had desisted for a reason given in his address to the reader. The actual later publication of that account may have been, according to Henry R. Wagner (*Sir Francis Drake's Voyage around the World*, page 239) postponed until after Drake's death in February, 1596. On the other hand, it is a fact brought out by Willis Holmes Kerr ("The Treatment of Drake's Circumnavigation in Hakluyt's 'Voyages,' 1589," in *PAPERS of the Bibliographical Society of America*, Vol. 34, Fourth Quarter, 1940) that of forty-seven copies of the 1589 Hakluyt examined by him or for him only seven lacked the Drake leaves. It is difficult to understand how so many copies of the book could have been perfected if the added leaves had been printed several years after the original publication and dissemination of the book. It is not impossible that the pages appeared at the time of the publication of the book in 1589 or very soon afterwards before the dispersion of any considerable part of the edition, an afterthought to an afterthought on the part of Hakluyt. Mr. Kerr brings out these facts and points to the trend of opinion in recent years as being that which has just been suggested. There is a possibility that the account of the voyage in Dutch pasted on the so-called Hondius Broadside may also have been printed before the De Bry account. But regardless of this matter of priority of accounts Miss Dickson seems to be on solid ground in her implied conclusion that Drake brought no tobacco seeds or plants home from his circumnavigation. That conclusion is borne out, negatively at least, by the omission of any account of the plant in Charles L'Écluse, *Aliquot Notae* of 1582, a work which contained descriptions of plants observed and collected on the Drake voyage around the world.

One may with justice, I think, disagree with Miss Dickson's exclusion of certain information from her references. The locations of a book as preëminently important and as excessively rare as the *Libretto* in 1504 as well as references to texts and translations of the book might have been given with advantage. As already said, Miss Dickson makes an admirable analysis of the work of Cárdenas, *Primera parte*, Mexico, 1591, but neither locates copies of it nor tells that it has been reprinted twice, the last time in Madrid (Ediciones Cultura Hispanica) in 1945. In describing the Champlain narrative of a voyage to the West Indies, she locates none of the existing copies of the manuscript and mentions only the Hakluyt Society publication of it in 1859, saying nothing of the greatly more important edition printed in 1922 from the John Carter Brown codex, with French text and translation into English by H. H. Langton, edited by

H. P. Biggar for the Champlain Society of Toronto. This later edition is accompanied by a portfolio of the original illustrations photographically reproduced in monochrome. It was the Hakluyt Society edition of the manuscript with the illustrations traced in pen outline which led Parkman to describe its beautiful watercolor drawings, unseen by him, as being "in a style of art which a child of ten might emulate" and, even more censoriously, as illustrations drawn in "absolute independence of the canons of Art." The Toronto edition of the illustrations, though not in color, removes that century-old aspersion upon their admirable quality.

From this digression I return to say with pleasure that Miss Dickson has written a definitive narrative on the historical concepts of the plant which has comforted mankind for four centuries, and which also has plagued him and upset his personal metabolism and the economy of his times and community, the plant which we take as "Tinkars doe ale" and which our world would find it hard to do without.

LAWRENCE C. WROTH

The John Carter Brown Library

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor of the PAPERS:

In his review of Professor Richard L. Purdy's bibliography of Thomas Hardy (PAPERS, 49 [1955], 85-89), Carl J. Weber states that "it is not free from errors and omissions. This fact places an obligation upon a reviewer. . . . It becomes necessary to assist those who use this Hardy Bibliography by the offer of such supplementary notes as a reviewer can provide." This generous promise is amply but ineptly fulfilled. After careful perusal and intensive use of the bibliography, I have found only two errors. The first is an obvious misprint, and the second was noted by Weber.

P. ix, fifth line from bottom, *Lfie* is a misprint for *Life*.

P. 288, lines 22-23. The Mellstock Edition was not printed from the plates of the Wessex Edition, as stated by Purdy, but was entirely reset. However, Purdy points out the essential fact that, save for *A Pair of Blue Eyes*, the Mellstock Edition is of little textual importance.

In many instances, Professor Weber has introduced error or controversy quite gratuitously. A few examples may suffice.

Purdy takes the unequivocal stand that *The Return of the Native* was published first in England, and thus "rejects the bibliographical findings" of the late Carroll A. Wilson, who placed the American edition first in an editorial emendation to Weber's article on *The Return* in PAPERS, 36 (1942), 37-45. Weber says that "Purdy is, of course, entitled to regard Wilson's idea as 'absurd' but *not* to suppress the fact, as he does, that the novel *was* advertised [by the American publisher] as 'ready' in September . . ."

If Purdy was guilty of suppression, his crime was suppressing error, not truth. The English edition was published on November 4, 1878. The American edition was not ready until December 14. The Henry Holt & Co. advertisement in the *Publishers' Weekly* of September 14, 1878, listed *The Return* under the heading "Nearly Ready," not under the heading "Just Ready," which covered a different list of books. *PW* for November 16 (Literary and Trade Notes) reported that the novel "will contain a

bird's-eye view of the scene of the story . . ." Holt's advertisement in the *Nation* for Thursday, December 12, stated that *The Return* "will be published on Saturday." In *PW* for December 14, Holt advertised the book as "Ready To-day."

In justice to Carroll Wilson, Weber should have noted that in the catalogue of his own collection, published after his death, Wilson calls the Holt edition the "First American and first 1-vol. edition," and adds that "all available information indicates that the American book was published on Dec. 14." It appears that Wilson and Purdy ultimately agreed, and were correct in their conclusions.

Another bibliographical finding rejected by Purdy is Weber's thesis (PAPERS, 40 [1946], 1-21) that the holograph manuscript of *Two on a Tower* now in the Houghton Library at Harvard University is in part the original MS sent to the *Atlantic Monthly*, and in part a duplicate MS which Hardy wrote that he was sending, "to guard against accidental loss." Weber's case was plausibly set forth, but he wrote without the knowledge that it was Hardy's custom in the 'seventies and 'eighties to make letter-press copies of his manuscripts, and he failed to note that the Harvard MS shows unmistakable evidence of having been through a letter-press, the ink being frequently slightly blurred from the wetting of the paper. It is certainly possible that Hardy and his wife undertook the labor of producing two holograph manuscripts to send to America, but Purdy is justified in concluding, after careful study of the evidence, that it is unlikely.

During the 1930's and '40's Professor Weber occasionally inspired the publication in book-form of stories and articles by Hardy which had previously appeared only in magazines. In general, these very posthumous editions are not mentioned in Purdy's bibliography, in accordance with his policy of singling out only printings with textual significance, for the most part. Weber cites a few of these omitted books, among them *The Intruder*, published by the Fairfield (Maine) Publishing Company on October 4, 1938, in an edition of ten copies. It might have been a kindness on Purdy's part not to record this minute edition because, when it was published, Weber was unaware that "The Intruder" was little more than a reprint of the closing episodes of "The Waiting Supper," a story which Hardy collected, in revised form, in *A Changed Man*.

Another omission of equal textual insignificance cited by Weber is *Maumbury Ring*, published by the Colby College Library in 1942 in an edition of 100 numbered copies, and in this connection he takes Purdy to task on other grounds also: "By his misinterpretation of Hardy's illustra-

tion of Maumbury Ring in *Wessex Poems* (1898), Professor Purdy has, on four pages . . . , mistakenly doubled the Ring [when referring to the place] into 'Rings'." On the contrary, Maumbury Rings is (Hardy notwithstanding) the correct term for the famous Roman amphitheater, and it is so referred to by such native authorities as Wilkinson Sherren (*The Wessex of Romance*, 1908, p. 124), Sir Frederick Treves (*Highways and Byways in Dorset*, 1906, p. 357), and H. J. Moule (*Dorchester Antiquities*, 1906, pp. 25, 29).

In a review extending to five pages, Weber devotes only two paragraphs to the positive merits of Purdy's bibliography. By encumbering his readers with assistance, Weber may have succeeded chiefly in confusing and discouraging them from using the best Hardy bibliography, and one of the most scholarly and useful bibliographies produced in this century.

FREDERICK B. ADAMS, JR.

The Pierpont Morgan Library

To the Editor of the PAPERS:

Referring to the article by Lloyd W. Griffin, "Christopher Colles and His Two American Map Series," which appeared in your PAPERS, Vol. 48, Second Quarter, 1954, we note that Mr. Griffin did not consult the files of the American Geographical Society when investigating the holdings of various libraries.

We have an imperfect copy of Colles' *Survey of Roads*, and also of his *Geographical Ledger*, minus the map.

The following plates are lacking from the copy in the library of the Society: 4, 17, 34 thru 39, 46, 47, 48-50, and 68.

Our copy of the *Geographical Ledger* contains the title, viii pp. Introduction, diagram by Eliza Colles sculp., References and Index to No. 1548, References to No. 1458 (and Index to 1458), and References and Index to 1459, but no map. We also have another copy, with pages uncut, of References and Index to 1549.

ENA L. YONGE, *Map Curator*

American Geographical Society
Broadway at 156th Street
New York 32, N. Y.

